



Cornell University Library
Ithaca, New York

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME OF THE
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF
HENRY W. SAGE

1891

Cornell University Library
PA 25.O98
pt.1-7
Oxford lectures on classical subjects, 1



3 1924 021 592 195

olin

This book was digitized by Microsoft Corporation in cooperation with Cornell University Libraries, 2007.

You may use and print this copy in limited quantity for your personal purposes, but may not distribute or provide access to it (or modified or partial versions of it) for revenue-generating or other commercial purposes.

Four Centuries
of
GREEK LEARNING
IN
ENGLAND

Inaugural Lecture delivered
before the University of Oxford on
8 March 1894

By
INGRAM BYWATER

Regius Professor of Greek

1893-1908

OXFORD
At the CLARENDON PRESS
M DCCC XIX

A 549822

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK

TORONTO MELBOURNE CAPE TOWN BOMBAY

HUMPHREY MILFORD

PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PRINTED IN ENGLAND.

Digitized by Microsoft®

BYWATER'S Inaugural Lecture was not printed in his lifetime ; it was not included in the list of his writings which he gave to the present Rector of Exeter ; and it was believed (e.g. by Dr. Jackson, *Memoir*, p. 129) that it had disappeared. It has recently been found in a collection of his notebooks, and is now in the Bodleian.

The Delegates of the Press while not unmindful of Bywater's views upon the publication of Remains have not been able to persuade themselves that this lecture should remain unpublished. The print follows closely its beautiful original.

FOUR CENTURIES OF GREEK LEARNING IN ENGLAND

It is one of my statutable duties to deliver from time to time a public lecture. This afternoon, when I am coming forward to give my first public address in my new capacity, I cannot doubt that the thoughts of all here present must be once more reverting to the very distinguished man whose position I have been appointed to occupy. We in this place knew him, during the last twenty years of his life, as the Master of a very distinguished College, as one who seemed to us a born ruler and director of men, as a very potent force in this University. We knew him, too, as a scholar of wide interests and large-minded sympathies, as one whom the humanists of a former age would have recognized and honoured as a kindred spirit. And outside the University, the world has known him as a most accomplished translator, as the author of a masterly translation of Plato, which has already taken rank as an English Classic. It is not for me, however, to speak at any length of him or of the mark that he has left on this generation. But there is one thing that I cannot leave unsaid. The living interest in Ancient Philosophy, which has been for many years one of the characteristics of Oxford, was mainly, if not entirely, due to his initiative. All who were privileged to hear his lectures on Plato and the Early Greek Philosophy will, I am sure, agree with me in saying that these lectures of his revealed a new world to us, and enabled us to see that without Greek Philosophy Greek history and literature lose half their meaning.

THE revival of Greek learning in Italy, the great event in the history of the Italian Renaissance, dates from 1396, the year in which the Greek Manuel Chrysoloras came to occupy what we should now call the chair of Greek language and literature at Florence. Greek thus became a part of Italian culture even before the taking of Constantinople by the Turks drove Bessarion and Lascaris and the other Greeks of the dispersion to seek a new home in Italy.

England, the land of Occam, Scotus, and Burley, was slow to feel the influence of the Renaissance : it was not till 1491 that we hear of a public teacher of Greek in an English university. The first signs of new life and awakened interest in the new learning in this country become observable about the middle of the fifteenth century, when the relations, political and social, between England and Italy were becoming closer than they had ever been before. A duke of Urbino received the Garter from our Edward the Fourth : Duke Humphrey filled his library with Italian MSS., and Italian scholars dedicated their works to him just as if he were a Pope or one of the Medici of the day. Caxton's patron, the brilliant and unfortunate Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, passed the years of his retirement from public life in the learned society that he found in Padua, Ròme, and elsewhere in Italy. Under these circumstances one cannot be surprised to hear of Englishmen of the scholarly class completing their education in an Italian university. The great teacher of Greek at this time was Guarino, who taught at Ferrara till his death in 1460 ; and in the long list of his more distinguished pupils we find the names of four Oxford men : William Gray, who had been Chancellor of Oxford in 1441 ; Robert Fleming, Dean of Lincoln ; John

Gundorpe ; and John Free, who is known to have taken his Master's degree at Oxford in 1454. Fleming, I may add, was of Lincoln College ; the others were from Balliol, and Gray is still remembered by his College as one of the benefactors of the College Library. Free made himself a reputation as a Greek scholar by a much-admired translation of the *Encomium Calvitii* of Synesius, and he has also been credited with the translation of Diodorus Siculus usually attributed to Poggio (Leland, p. 467) and with a version of sundry works of Xenophon (Bale, p. 614). We have no positive evidence as to the Greek attainments of the rest, but Leland tells us that he had seen a Graeco-Latin lexicon compiled by Fleming, and one may still see in the Bodleian a Greek MS. (Laud. Gr. 28) of the Liturgy of St. Basil with notes stating that the MS. had been borrowed by Fleming from Darley Abbey (in Derbyshire) in 1452 and duly returned.

Later on in the century other Englishmen followed the example of these men and turned their steps to Italy to become pupils of Politian and Chalcondyles. One of Politian's pupils was William Tilly or Selling, a monk of Canterbury, whom Leland describes as an ardent collector of Greek books, and whom we may well remember as the man who enabled Linacre to undertake his Italian journey in 1485.

Considering the great obscurity that hangs over the literary history of this period, I may be permitted to point out two or three facts as some indication of the growing interest in Greek learning in this country. In 1474 Demetrius Cantacuzene is in London copying Greek MSS. for English use (Omont : *Fac-similés de MSS. grecs*, 1887, p. 11), just as at a later moment in the century (1495) we find John Serbopulus installed as a regular copyist of Greek MSS. in the Abbey at Reading. And

about the same time, in 1476, we actually find a learned Greek established in London—no less a personage than Andronicus Callistus, one of the Greeks of the dispersion—a man whom his contemporaries regarded as almost the equal of Theodore Gaza, and who claims a place in history not only by his writings but also as the Greek teacher of Politian. Years before this he had been one of Free's friends (Hody, p. 228); and the probability is that he was known to most of the travelled English of the time, either personally or by reputation. As teaching was his profession he must have come here to teach Greek—to do in England what his friend George Hermonymus did for Greek learning in France. He seems, however, to have died very shortly after his arrival,¹ before he had time to produce any effect, and there is not so much as a record of his name in any of our received histories of English learning.

The one man, however, who may claim to have been the first to naturalize Greek studies in England is William Grocyn, the first who undertook to teach Greek in an English university. Grocyn's work in this capacity begins in 1491; but there is some reason to think that even before this there was in Oxford not only an interest in Greek matters but also the possibility of acquiring at any rate some elementary knowledge of the language. The learned Italian humanist Cornelius Vitelli of Corneto, whom Chaundler, Warden of New College, brought over from Italy to teach the new learning in Oxford, was no doubt primarily a Latinist: his contemporary, Bernard André,² describes him as 'facundissimus orator', which practically means a 'master of elegant Latinity', and his one contribution to literature is in a Latin book—an edition of Perotti's *Cornucopiae*.

¹ Lascaris *ap.* Legrand, I, p. lvi, n. 3. ² Vita Henrici VII, p. 56.

At the same time one has to remember that a well-educated Italian scholar of this period could hardly be without some tincture of Greek; and if he knew any Greek it is hardly likely that Grocyn, Linacre, and the rest would allow him to keep it to himself. There is distinct evidence¹ in the case of Grocyn that he had acquired the rudiments of Greek before he started for Italy, and it is a reasonable conjecture at any rate that he may have owed this to his Italian friend, Cornelius Vitelli.

Grocyn was a middle-aged man when he at length made the Italian journey and joined the throng that crowded the class-rooms of Politian and Chalcondyles. On his return in 1490 he began a new life as a teacher of Greek in Oxford. The Register of Exeter College shows that instead of taking up his abode in Magdalen or New College he now rented rooms in Exeter; and I hope I may be permitted to retain my faith in the tradition that the first regular teaching of Greek in the University was within the walls of this College. In this work of teaching he had before long associated with him two younger men, Linacre and Latimer. Linacre, the learned physician, is the first considerable name in the history of English classical learning. Grocyn's energies were absorbed in teaching; whereas Linacre, in spite of professional and official demands on his time, was able to give to the world a great deal of Galen and Proclus on the Sphere in a Latin form, so admirable that his contemporaries exhaust the language of eulogy in their admiration of it, and it is said that he had prepared a translation of a third of Aristotle in the hope that Grocyn and Latimer would fulfil their promise to finish the rest.

In this way then, in the last years of the fifteenth century, Oxford had, for the first time in history, a school

¹ Latimer, quoted by Burrows, p. 346.

of Greek—a school of such distinction that Erasmus is able to say, with perhaps some little friendly overstatement, that it was now no longer necessary to cross the Alps to learn Greek as there were men in Oxford quite as well able to teach it as the Italians.

The fame of this Oxford school attracted Richard Croke from Cambridge, and thus a pupil of Grocyn eventually became, in 1518, the first public reader in Greek in the sister University.

The introduction, however, of Greek at Cambridge is mainly due to Erasmus, who taught there—according to his own account, with little encouragement or success—in 1511 during his third sojourn in England. About this time the significance of the movement in the direction of the new learning is attested by the vigorous opposition it had to face from the obscurantist parties in the Universities. The obscurantists—the Trojans, as they preferred to call themselves—had good reason to hate the new studies, since Greek was not only a newfangled thing but also, what was even worse, the language of a schismatic church and people. The reply to all this takes a concrete form in the foundation in 1516 of a new Oxford college, consecrated from the first to the advancement of the new learning. Corpus Christi College is, like the great schools recently founded at Rome, Louvain, and Paris, designed by statute to be a *Collegium trilingue*—an institution for the study of the three languages of all sacred and secular learning—Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The Corpus Reader in Theology is in his interpretations of scripture to follow as far as possible ‘the holy and ancient doctors, both Latin and Greek, and especially Jerome, Austin, Ambrose, Origen, Hilary, Chrysostom, Damascenus, and others of that sort’:¹ the Corpus Reader in Greek,

¹ Ward’s stat. p. 104.

among his other duties, is to ' read on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays some part of the Grammar of Theodorus or other approved Greek grammarian, together with some part of Isocrates, Lucian, or Philostratus ; on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays he is to read Aristophanes, Theocritus, Euripides, Sophocles, Pindar, or Hesiod, or some other of the most ancient Greek poets, together with some portion of Demosthenes, Thucydides, Aristotle, Theophrastus, or Plutarch ; on holidays, Homer, the Epigrams, or some passage from the divine Plato, or some Greek theologian '.¹

Greek is now, if I may use the expression, regularly established and endowed as a part of the higher education in England. It is recognized with equal emphasis in the great foundations of Christ Church and Trinity College, Cambridge ; in Colet's noble institution, St. Paul's School ; and to a great degree in the multitudinous grammar schools founded, some few years later, on the Pauline model.

To the men of this period Greek was a matter of supreme interest and importance. They were drawn to it as humanists by the treasures of literature, science, and philosophy that it contained ; and they were drawn to it as theologians because it took them back to what they regarded as a purer and better form of Christian life and doctrine. Our English humanists accordingly—Grocyn, Linacre, Colet, More, Pace, and the rest—are all men of the same type as Erasmus : Reformers before the Reformation. There is nothing of the pagan spirit in our English Renaissance. And it seems to me, if I may venture to express an opinion, that we are apt to exaggerate the pagan character even of the Italian Renaissance. In the Latin literature of the Italian Renaissance there is

¹ Ward, p. 101.

no doubt a vein of pagan licentiousness, but one must not take this too seriously, as it is generally nothing more than a literary affectation. On the Greek side, however, there is very little of this ; there is nothing of it in Bessarion, or Pico della Mirandola, or Ficinus. And we must never forget that Aldus Manutius printed a collection of *Poetae Christiani*, and that among the very first of his greater undertakings was a project to give the world the real Bible in Hebrew and Greek, the original tongues.

At the time of the Reformation there was apparently a wide diffusion of the new learning in the upper classes in England. We all know how Ascham found Lady Jane Grey reading her Plato, and he tells us also that the Princess (afterwards Queen) Elizabeth read Isocrates, Sophocles, and the Greek Testament with him.

The one noteworthy fact in the history of the Greek learning of this period is the controversy as to the pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge. The older English Greek scholars had followed the modern Greek pronunciation—the pronunciation which they had learnt from their Italian and Greek teachers. Cheke, the Regius Professor, and his friend Thomas (afterwards Sir Thomas) Smith, came to the conclusion that this was radically wrong, and devoid of any historical or rational basis ; and they had arrived at this view, apparently, before they became aware that Erasmus had written a famous monograph on the subject. When the reformed pronunciation came to be adopted in practice, Gardiner, the Chancellor of the University, denounced the innovation in an edict threatening all innovators in the matter of pronunciation with the direst pains and penalties : even a schoolboy, who ventures to speak in the new way, is to be whipped for his ‘temerity’. The two chief offenders, though bowing to the Chancellor’s authority, drew up long and elaborate

replies ; that of Smith seems to me a model of scholarly argument and a wonderful production for that age. If the modern Greek (he argues) has lost so much of the grammar and vocabulary of the ancient tongue, can we suppose him to be much better in the matter of pronunciation ? His pronunciation is probably as degenerate as his language. And Smith undertakes to show that this is really the case, and that the evidence to be found in the classical writers themselves, as also that of the ancient grammarians, is sufficient to prove that the ancient pronunciation was very unlike that of the modern Greeks.

The Elizabethan age is almost a blank in the history of Greek learning in England. It produced a few translations—mostly of books bearing on matters of theological controversy—but there is hardly a trace in it of that large interest in Greek antiquity which characterized the humanists of the early part of the century.

Whatever the explanation may be, the situation changes when we come to James I's reign, and from that moment there is no dearth of distinguished names in the annals of English learning. To my mind one of the greatest of these names is that of Sir Henry Savile. Savile's Chrysostom is the outward and visible sign of a great revival of Greek studies in England ; but it is no adequate measure of what Savile did for English learning. More than one of the scholars of the next generation owed his inspiration to him ; and, as we are all bound to remember in this place, he founded the two Savilian chairs, and thus created the study of Greek mathematics in Oxford—a study which was long the special glory of this University. It was thus to Savile that we owe the Collection of the Greek Mathematicians of Wallis, and the Euclid of David Gregory.

In the generation immediately after Savile comes

Selden, a man of universal knowledge, whose distinction as a Greek scholar is apt to be overshadowed by his distinction as a jurist and as a Hebraist, so that we forget that he was the first editor of the *Marmor Parium*. But the great Greek scholar of the Caroline age is, I think, beyond a doubt Gataker, whose *Antoninus* is to this day a book of unquestioned value and authority.

In the second half of the seventeenth century we have in England a whole series of considerable Greek scholars : first of all Stanley, the editor of the first English edition of *Aeschylus* and the author of the first history of Greek philosophy in the English language ; then Pearson, Gale, Wallis, Hody, Mill, and Chilmead. Though they were none of them scholars of the first order, they compare very favourably with their contemporaries in France, Holland, and Germany. Germany seems to have been still suffering from the effects of the Thirty Years War ; France was no longer in touch with the Greek literature of the Classical period ; and the great Dutch school of Greek scholars had not yet come into existence.

The last product of the seventeenth century is Richard Bentley, and even in the entire history of European learning the world has never had but one Bentley.

It may be hard for us to realize, but the fact is that for centuries Greek was far behind Latin scholarship. The pre-Bentleian Greek scholars had as a rule been content to produce either Greek texts of a very rough-and-ready sort, or translations embodying the first ideas of interpretation or illustrative commentaries, either unsystematic in the form of *adversaria*, &c., or systematic like what we have in Casaubon's *Theophrastus* and *Athenaeus*. Hardly a man among them thought of going beyond this ; hardly a man among them felt that, in the interests of historic truth, the reconstruction and recovery of the

true text by sustained methodic criticism is the first duty of a critical scholar. Bentley saw this, and he was the first Greek scholar who had a clear perception of it.

We cannot judge him by the actual work he left behind him. A man of greater promise than performance, he conceived large ideas and great schemes, but he did not execute a tithe of what he projected : it was rather by showing how the work should be done, or by fruitful suggestions, or by active encouragement of others, that he has left his mark on Greek learning. For a whole century the scholars of England and Holland were working on Bentleian lines ; and even at the present moment we are in more than one department of knowledge only doing—no doubt with a fuller equipment and greater fineness of method—that which Bentley indicated as the thing that had to be done.

Early in life Bentley conceived two great projects—a complete edition of the Greek lexicographers, and a new collection of the fragments of the Greek poets. The edition of the Lexicographers never came to anything ; but Bentley's interest in them passed on to his successors, and there is hardly an English or Dutch scholar in the eighteenth century who is not known as a student and critic of the Greek lexicographers. Toup's chief work is on Suidas ; Porson edited Photius ; the Porsonians knew Hesychius by heart ; but it was reserved for our own century to see as the final result of these studies in England the monumental work of Gaisford, his Suidas and his *Etymologicum Magnum*.

Bentley's chief work was on the Greek poets. What he could do for the poets was shown in his first work, his *Epistle to Mill*, written when he was just twenty-eight, but evincing a power and maturity which made foreigners see that a great scholar had arisen in England. In this,

and still more in his Emendations to Menander, all Bentley's great qualities are seen—a fine sense of metre and language, a logic at once acute and robust, a complete mastery over all the facts of critical moment. Looking at his emendations one may perhaps in these days think he had easy work before him. This is a mere illusion; he succeeded where Grotius and Casaubon had failed; he did what the greatest of his predecessors could not do.

Passing over his services to Aristophanes, to Nicander and Callimachus, I may remind you of what he did for Homer. His recognition of the digamma as a factor in Homeric language and versification is, I take it, one of the most important discoveries ever made by one man in classical philology—so much so that one can hardly imagine a philological investigation of Greek and its affinities without a due recognition of the digamma. Bentley was in this just a century in advance of his age; even Wolf had no idea of the value and significance of Bentley's discovery.

Bentley, in fact, was constantly in advance of his age; One has only to consider his place in the history of New Testament criticism. Before Bentley took the subject in hand, the utmost aim of scholars was to present the received text with a farrago of readings from MSS. of all ages and descriptions. Bentley's aim, on the contrary, was to restore the oldest knowable text—the text as it was at the time of the council of Nicaea; and he showed equal discernment in the choice of means; he proposed to restrict himself to the evidence of the oldest Greek MSS., supplemented by that of the Vulgate and certain Oriental versions of great antiquity. If Bentley had never done anything besides this, he might still claim to go down to posterity as the man who anticipated by a whole

century the work of Lachmann, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort.

Bentley's chief interest, however, was in Greek poetry ; and the chief interest of his immediate successors also was in the Greek poets and the restoration of their texts. There were some among them, no doubt, notably John Taylor, and to a lesser degree Toup and Tyrwhitt, who devoted themselves to the great prose writers ; but the school of Bentley, if the expression may be hazarded, Markland, Dawes, Musgrave, Warton, and the rest, allowed itself to be absorbed in the study of the Greek poets. If I were asked who was the strong man and chief figure in this company, I should say with little hesitation, Richard Dawes. He left very little, one small volume of *Miscellanea* ; but our Greek grammars to this day have to consider his theories, and his book was a sort of breviary with Porson and the Porsonians. Even in our own time Professor Cobet of Leyden was able to say of it, that a new light broke in upon him when he first came across the *Miscellanea Critica* of Richard Dawes.

The end of the last century saw the rise of Porson and the Porsonian school of Greek scholars. These men, in the direction their studies take, as also in many other characteristics, are essentially disciples of Dawes and Bentley ; but it seems to me that we must also recognize in their work a certain influence from the great Dutch school. Unlike Bentley, Porson is rarely guilty of a crude or hasty suggestion, or of tampering with a passage which is not clearly and demonstrably corrupt. He is, in fact, a model of caution and patience, not an impetuous genius like Bentley or Dawes.

Porson is now mainly known as one who settled the canons of the Greek trimeter, and as the author of certain emendations which appear in our editions of the Greek

dramatists. He was really a much larger man than this estimate implies. What he might have done for Greek learning at Cambridge, if he had been allowed to lecture and devote himself, as seriously as he himself wished, to the duties of his chair, it is impossible to say ; as it was, however, he certainly created a school, creating it by the only means left to him, by books and articles, by personal intercourse and correspondence. So far from being a man of narrow interests, he was a remarkably well-read man : he was a student of Plato, at a time when Plato was little read in England ; he was quite at home in the study of inscriptions ; when advice was wanted on a matter connected with the Herculanean papyri, Tyrwhitt declared that Porson was the only man in England qualified to give an opinion. And of his one contribution to learned theology, his Reply to Travis, Gibbon was able to say that it was ' the most acute and accurate piece of criticism since the days of Bentley '.

The Porsonian school, Blomfield, Monk, and Elmsley, if I may include him among them, continued Porson's work on the dramatists, though with little of Porson's freshness or felicity of touch. If the mantle of the master descended on any one, it was rather on Dobree, who brought some of the best qualities of the Porson school to bear on the text and language of the Greek orators. I may add that Dobree's *Adversaria* have had the almost unique distinction of being reprinted within the last twenty years in Germany. The last representative of the school was, I suppose, the late Charles Badham, who died some five years ago in Australia ; and it is significant of the state of English opinion that he was more valued in Holland and Germany than in his own country.

Notwithstanding their great merits, there was, it must be admitted, a certain insularity and narrowness in the

men of the Porson school. Absorbed in the technique of metre and language, they neglected interpretation, and the collateral studies which bear on interpretation; they had no idea of philology in the large sense in which Boeckh and Ottfried Müller understood the term. As soon as this came to be felt, a new direction of studies became inevitable. So far as the Universities are concerned, the reaction had already set in in 1830, when Thirlwall and his friends were labouring to give a wider and more liberal character to Cambridge studies. From that moment, and for the next thirty years, the tendency of all that was most striking and distinguished in English learning was towards history, and the historical interpretation of antiquity and ancient literature. No one can regret a movement that gave us such works as the *Histories* of Grote and Thirlwall, and Arnold's *Thucydides*; but it is impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that the new learning tended to drive out the old learning, and that we lost to some extent our ancient reputation for severe and exact critical scholarship.

As the present is not a good judge of the present, I need not speak of the more recent forms and phases of Greek learning in this country. Nor will I venture on a forecast of the future of Greek learning, or speculate as to the conditions under which it will be allowed to survive, or the directions which it may take. These matters belong to the politician and the prophet, and I personally cannot claim to be either of these. But I may perhaps plead privilege and say just one word to those who are seriously minded to give some portion of their lives and thoughts to classical studies. Success in these studies—I mean, of course, legitimate success, the success which is a credit, and creditably won—depends quite as much on the morality as on the intellectual aptitude of the student.

It implies amongst other things a love of knowledge for its own sake, a power of sacrificing the present to the future, a renunciation of petty interests and distractions. I will not essay a sketch of the personality of the ideal student ; the whole duty of the scholar is assuredly a very large and complex subject ; but without any attempt at being exhaustive, I think it may not be inopportune to note two points as unquestionably characteristic of the true scholar :

1. He has to take more thought of quality than of quantity in his work ; he does not seek to make an imposing demonstration.

2. He has to avoid all parade of learning, and not only this but also paradox, the parade of cleverness ; there is a certain sincerity, caution, modesty, and reserve in his thoughts, as well as in his utterances.

Have more than thou showest,
Speak less than thou knowest

is a rule for him, as it is for all wise and reasonable men of the world also.

ON ARISTOTLE AS A BIOLOGIST

WITH A

PROOEMION ON HERBERT SPENCER

BEING THE HERBERT SPENCER LECTURE
DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD, ON FEBRUARY 14, 1913

BY

D'ARCY WENTWORTH THOMPSON

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1913

HENRY FROWDE
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK, TORONTO
MELBOURNE AND BOMBAY

ON ARISTOTLE AS A BIOLOGIST:

WITH A PROOEMION ON HERBERT SPENCER

HERBERT SPENCER was born when last century was young, and this century was in its cradle when he passed away. *Ipsæ Epicurus obit*, cried the poet of a philosophy which of all the systems of antiquity was most kindred to Spencer's own. A like thought passed through many men's hearts when Herbert Spencer died—men of all nations and languages, for while Spencer lived his voice reached far and wide, even to the ends of the earth. He was a philosopher not speaking to the philosophers, nor teaching in the schools; but he had a gift and a message, so in touch with the temper of his time, that it made him a speaker, *ex cathedra*, to the world. No philosopher of modern times, not Kant himself, has exercised in his lifetime so wide a dominion. Only here and there, among men of a very different stamp, in men like Byron or Rousseau or Tolstoi, do we see that strange power of captivating the imagination of an age, of speaking with a voice that goes out into all lands. The foundation under whose auspices we gather here, the gift of an Indian scholar, reminds us of Spencer's influence in the East: in still more distant Japan his counsel was sought when the nation issued from its seclusion to join in the labours and anxieties of the modern world; he stirred the restless blood of Russians and of Poles; in America his books were read far more sedulously than at home; and all this great influence was won without literary art

or any charm of magic words, without the fire of Tolstoi, the poetry of Heine or of Byron, the beauty of Rousseau's prose. But Spencer had something in common with all those men, as his popularity was commensurate with their own. And that bond of likeness lay in the fact that to men weary of old trammels and of old burdens he seemed to point, he tried to offer,¹ a way of emancipation, a path of deliverance from creeds outworn. By the world which he addressed he was welcomed and acclaimed, in the spirit in which Heine wished to be remembered, as a gallant soldier, *ein tapfrer Krieger*, in the fight for freedom.

Let us recall, with all brevity, some few circumstances of Spencer's life, that our minds may keep his memory green.

Of that narrow, ascetic, and fiercely independent home of his boyhood we have all read or heard—with its atmosphere of struggle, of criticism, of scientific and political discussion, unrelieved by humour, by letters, or by art. We remember how he went forth as a lad to labour, at an age when men have not yet come up to the University; and how, as an engineer's assistant, he helped to plan bridges and direct gangs of navvies on the great new road to Birmingham and Crewe, and shared in all the fever and haste of that great period of construction. These were the years that he spoke of afterwards as 'the futile part of his life'; but it is as plain as an open book that they were years in which his mind was moulded and his mechanical outlook on phenomena developed and confirmed. Again, we remember his years of journalism, during which, after the appearance of his first book, he soon emerged from a lonely life, and with the friendship

¹ Compare the opening passage of *Social Studies* (1864). "'Give us a guide," cry men to the philosopher. "We would escape from these miseries in which we are entangled,"' &c.

of George Eliot and Lewes, Huxley, Tyndall, and many more, found his place in the world of London. Henceforth, his life was so quiet, simple and retired, that we might say of him, as Heine said of Kant, 'Er hatte weder Leben noch Geschichte.'

In 1855, in the *Principles of Psychology*, Spencer affirmed his belief in the 'development hypothesis',¹ as accounting for the origin of species; and as accounting also for the successive association of ideas, and so, by their becoming 'innate' and transmissible from generation to generation, for the gradual development of mind: which latter investigation, I need hardly say, has since been continued, by a long line of evolutionary psychologists, in their several and divergent ways. It is curious to learn from his Autobiography that about this time, in his talks with Huxley, it was the latter who still preserved a guarded attitude, and Spencer who urged upon him, but with still inadequate and unconvincing arguments, the hypothesis of organic evolution.

Five years later, a year after the publication of the *Origin of Species*, Spencer brought out the prospectus of his *Synthetic Philosophy*, that heroic effort to combine, in a Philosophy of Evolution, the whole range of physical, mental, and social science. To discover and trace that one identical phenomenon of Evolution, in the progress of civilization, in the development of mind, in the course of nature, in the history of the Universe, was his single and life-long aim.

He found such tools as he worked with in the current tendencies of political and economic thought, and in the recent discoveries or generalizations of science. Of these latter, on the physical side, the greatest was the principle

¹ As already, in 1852, he had done in his essay on the *Development Hypothesis*.

of the Conservation of Energy, the final result of the doctrine of the correlation of the physical forces, in establishing which Rumford had led the way ; while on the biological side he drew inspiration from the fact, indicated by Aristotle, developed by Wolff and Milne-Edwards, made into an aphorism by Von Baer, that as the organism grows it grows continually from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to a greater and greater heterogeneity.¹

But many years before Von Baer a greater than he had enunciated the same truth, and had set it forth in even plainer and better words. It was Goethe, in his *Zur Morphologie*,² who laid it down as a law that ' the more imperfect a being is, the more do its individual parts resemble each other, and the more do these parts resemble the whole. The more perfect the being is, the more dissimilar are its parts. In the former case the parts are more or less a repetition of the whole ; in the latter case they are totally unlike the whole. The more the parts resemble each other, the less subordination is there of one to the other ; and subordination of parts is the mark of high grade of organization.'³ Now these words are found in the *Life of Goethe*, by Lewes, Herbert Spencer's closest friend. We can scarce avoid the inference that it may have been the poet's insight and the poet's words, quite as much as Von Baer's, that crystallized in his famous formula of evolution. And the inference is confirmed by the fact that, though it was to Von Baer that Spencer was afterwards in the habit of ascribing the law, yet, on the first

¹ The 'law of differentiation', or of 'organic progress', was first propounded by Spencer in his essay on *Progress, its Law and Cause* (1857), where he argued that it was also the law of all progress whatsoever.

² 1807 (written in 1795). Republished in Goethe's *Werke*, xxxvi, p. 7.

³ Lewes, *Life of Goethe* (1855), 3rd ed. 1875, p. 358.

occasion when he mentions it, he speaks of it as having been established ' by the investigations of Wolff, Goethe, and Von Baer '.¹

As in former days Descartes, and as Democritus and Epicurus in days of old, so did Spencer find in matter and in motion, or rather in matter and in force, the fabric of a world. He draws a broad picture, confessedly of a mechanical kind, of alternate cosmic rhythms of the Universe, in which as motion is dissipated, so matter cleaves from the dispersed and homogeneous into more coherent and more segregated shapes ; until in the turn of the great wheel, a new redistribution of matter and motion takes place, and evolution is inevitably followed by dissolution at its heels ; so the whole present order perishes, *exitio terras cum dabit una dies*. Nevertheless, so vast is the cosmic rhythm, that again the wheel turns, and the dust and ashes of a Universe are co-ordinated and integrated anew, to make ' another and another frame of things, For ever ! '

All the while Spencer recognizes that Space, Time, Motion, and Matter itself are remote from Absolute Reality, and have their source in our own Empiricism. The ' Persistence of Force ' is the only truth which transcends experience ; and what we ultimately mean by the persistence of force is a cause which transcends our conception and our knowledge.

In his *Biology* Spencer takes for his keynote his conception of life, as having for its chief characteristic a continuous adjustment of the organism to its environment, of its internal to its external relations. So structure follows upon function and functional need, and hereditary transmission hands on to the next generation the advances

¹ Von Baer himself claimed no priority. ' Dieses Gesetz ist wohl nie verkannt worden,' *Zur Entwicklungsgesch.* (1), p. 153.

that the past generation has made: life produces organization, and not organization life. Again, in certain chapters which are by no means the least interesting of the book, he shows,¹ after the fashion of the engineer, and from the experience of the bridge-builder,² how the principles of stress and strain are concerned in the fabric, and in the physiology, of the organism; how physical and mechanical relations alter in the organism with increasing bulk;³ and how incident forces of gravity, growth, and pressure control or determine the shape of leaf and bone and single cell. Under the guidance of a wholesome restraint, a whole school of morphologists, Roux's school of *Entwickelungsmechanik*, are now investigating these self-same problems, and so bringing to the help of morphology some of those physical concepts which began to be the stock-in-trade of the physiologists when Majendie wrote his *Leçons sur les phénomènes physiques de la Vie* (1830).

In the *Ethics*, Spencer undertakes to establish 'rules of right conduct' on a scientific basis, and he does not minimize the difficulty of getting rid of 'supernatural ethics', nor of forming a science of 'what ought to be'. Nevertheless, he does his best to connect absolute Ethics with his universal formula of cosmic evolution and equilibration. Ethics must be based on science, and not on metaphysics. There is, he holds, not only an Ethic for all reasonable beings, but a principle of Ethic for all living things; life

¹ As in an earlier essay on *The Law of Organic Symmetry*, 1859.

² Even in his *Sociology*, where he discusses the place of the *pontifices* in an archaic priesthood, he seems to dally with peculiar affection over these old *bridge-builders*.

³ A curious corollary, or case in point, is found in the fact that definite limits are set to the size of a terrestrial animal, and still more to that of a flying bird, while the aquatic animal, comparatively immune from gravity, increases in locomotive speed, as a ship does, the bigger it becomes (*Princ. of Biology* (2nd ed.), i. 156).

and not reason is the essential thing. All conservation implies evolution, and individuality is developed by the inevitable changes of a changing world.¹ So Spencer labours, but perhaps in vain, to make the best of the *bellum omnium contra omnes*, to find in the biological process of adjustment a continual tendency to happiness, and in sociological evolution a tendency to ultimate harmony ; in the which a somewhat complacent altruism shall satisfy the egoist, and pleasure will consist in actions which are salutary to the individual and the race. All very much as Mr. Bridges puts it :

For Nature did not idly spend
Pleasure ; she ruled it should attend
On every act that doth amend
Our life's condition ;
'Tis therefore not well-being's end
But its fruition.

So through all the circle of the sciences, Spencer tried to satisfy that craving inherent in mankind for a constructive system, which shall, in a single unity, frame all the phenomena of the world : for such a unification as in Aristotle's hands had endured unshaken for nigh two thousand years. To bring the world of fact and the world of Intelligence into the unity of a system is the task which all philosophers essay, in the light of the knowledge and the spirit of their time ; but as knowledge grows, and men's ways and circumstances change, so does Philosophy itself, like all else in the world, undergo its own inevitable and endless evolution—giving place, if not to the better, to the new.²

¹ 'C'est là l'idée capitale qu'il ajoute aux doctrines de Zénon, de Spinoza et de Volney : ' Guyau, *La Morale anglaise contemporaine*, 1885, p. 268.

² The last words are quoted from Alden, *A Study of Death* (1895), 1903, p. 176 ; cf. *North Amer. Review*, January 1913.

But let me not omit to say a word of Spencer's attitude to 'the insoluble mystery', of his *confessio ignorantis*, of his share in that Agnosticism for which Huxley found a name. 'At the utmost extent of his tether,' to borrow words from Locke, 'he sat down in quiet ignorance of those things which he found to be beyond the reach of his comprehension.'

By a bold abstraction Spencer puts asunder things that our thought insists shall be conjoined. And, through relation, association, and causation, he carried to their bitter end those theories of empiricism, and of the relativity of knowledge, that were no new thing in philosophy, but had percolated down to him through Mansel and through Hamilton, from Locke and Hume and Kant, through all those who had discussed the possibility of knowledge in itself; carried them to their bitter end, and stripped them bare of the garments of the old philosophy, of intuition, or of faith, wherewithal they were wont to be clothed. And in so doing it may seem to many of us that he stopped short but a little way along that steep and narrow road, that *parvus trames*, which is the Pathway from Appearance to Reality.

Ipse Epicurus obit, decurso lumine vitae—'when the lamp of life ran low'. And so too Spencer died—as it were but yesterday—full of years and of honour. And to the multitude of friends, disciples, mourners, gathered at his grave, a wise and eloquent man spoke a few noble words. He spoke of Spencer's deep affections and lasting friendships, of the houses that he entered as an habitual guest and honoured friend; of the magnitude of his task, of his unwearied struggle, and of his joy when his work was done; of his 'coherent, luminous, conception of the evolution of the world'; of his exaltation of man's individual freedom, of the ethical

purpose that underlay his quest of truth. And, lastly, Lord Courtney spoke of Spencer's last brave effort, in the *Riddle of the Universe*, to face and scrutinize the implacable facts of life : of how in the end he had confessed himself overawed by the vastness of the unknowable, appalled by the great vision of Everlasting Law, and silent in the contemplation of the Infinite and the Eternal.

And now that I have tried to pay, in not ungrateful words, our annual tribute to Spencer's memory, as to one who has been a great influence in our world, whose words have become part of our familiar speech, and whose thought has interpenetrated and commingled with our own, let me proceed for what time remains towards another, but I hope a cognate, theme.

In passing from Spencer to Aristotle, we turn from the one philosopher of our own times who has made biology an intrinsic part of his sociology and his psychology, to the great biologist of antiquity, who is *maestro di color che sanno*, in this science as in so many other departments of knowledge. And by the analogy of contrast, we can scarce think of Herbert Spencer's biology without recurring to that of Aristotle, so reverting from a great teacher of mechanical causation to him who taught us our first clear lessons of the phenomena of Life. But, save only by repeating what I have said, that Spencer came to the study of biology in the spirit and with the equipment of the engineer, and by declaring that Aristotle seems to me to have been first and foremost a biologist, by inclination and by training, I will not attempt to pursue the comparison. Let us simply glance at some parts of Aristotle's *Natural History*, and attempt to show, in a partial and elementary way, the influence of that study upon his mind.

The naturalist is born a naturalist, and we may be sure that Aristotle was a lover and a student of nature from a boy ; but it would help us to trace the relation of his biological studies to his philosophical work if we could ascertain when his chief biological work was done. It has often been held that Aristotle devoted himself to biology as an old man's recreation, after his retirement to Euboea. This theory is not adequate, and I do not think it is true. Another legend, that Alexander sent his pupil specimens from his campaigns, Cuvier accepted and Humboldt denied ; there is no evidence for it, direct or indirect, in Aristotle's writings, and this tradition also I believe to be worthless. But there is evidence, of a geographical kind, that helps us to answer our preliminary question.

Among the isles of Greece there is a certain island, *insula nobilis et amoena*, which Aristotle knew well. It lies on the Asian side, between the Troad and the Mysian coast, and far into its bosom, by the little town of Pyrrha, runs a broad and sheltered lagoon. It is the island of Lesbos. Here Aristotle came and spent two years of his life, in middle age, bringing his princess-bride from the petty court of a little neighbouring state where he had already spent three years. It was just before he went to Macedon to educate Alexander ; it was ten years later that he went back to Athens to begin teaching in the Lyceum. Now in the *Natural History* references to places in Greece proper are very few indeed ; there is much more frequent mention of places on the northern and eastern coasts of the Aegean, from Aristotle's own homeland down to the Carian coast ; and to places in and round that island of Lesbos, or Mitylene, a whole cluster of Aristotle's statements and descriptions refer. Here, for instance, Aristotle mentions a peculiarity of the deer on

a neighbouring islet, of the weasels by the wayside near another island town. He speaks of the big purple Murex shells at Cape Lectum, and of the different sorts of sponges found on the landward and the seaward side of Cape Malia. But it is to the lagoon at Pyrrha that Aristotle oftenest alludes. Here were starfish in such abundance as to be a pest to the fishermen; here the scallops had been exterminated by a period of drought, and by the continual working of the fishermen's dredge; here the sea-urchins come into season in the winter time, an unusual circumstance. Here among the cuttlefishes was found no octopus, either of the common or of the musky kind; here was no parrot-wrasse, nor any kind of spiny fish, nor sea-crawfish, nor the spotted nor the spiny dog-fish; and, again, from this lagoon, all the fishes, save only a little gudgeon, migrated seaward to breed. And though with no special application to the island, but only to the Asiatic coast in general, I may add that the chameleon, which is the subject of one of Aristotle's most perfect and minute investigations, is here comparatively common, but is not known to occur in Greece at all.

I take it then as probable, or even proven, that an important part of Aristotle's work in natural history was done upon the Asiatic coast, and in and near to Mitylene.¹ He will be a lucky naturalist who shall go some day and spend a quiet summer by that calm lagoon, find there all the natural wealth *ὅσον Λέσβος . . . ἐντὸς ἐέργει*, and have around his feet the creatures that Aristotle loved and knew. Moreover, it follows for certain, if all this be true, that Aristotle's biological studies preceded his more strictly philosophical work; and it is of no small importance that we should be (as far as

¹ Perhaps it was here also that Aristotle found his 'Lesbian rule'.

possible) assured of this, when we speculate upon the influence of his biology on his philosophy.¹

Aristotle is no tyro in biology. When he writes upon Mechanics or on Physics we read him with difficulty : his ways are not our ways ; his explanations seem laboured ; his science has an archaic look, as it were coming from another world to ours, a world before Galileo. Speaking with all diffidence, I have my doubts as to his mathematics. In spite of a certain formidable passage in the Ethics, where we have a sort of *ethica more geometrico demonstrata*, in spite of his favourite use of the equality of the angles of a triangle to two right angles as an example of proof indisputable, in spite even of his treatise *De Lineis Insecabilibus*, I am tempted to suspect that he sometimes passed shyly beneath the superscription over Plato's door.

But he was, and is, a very great naturalist. When he treats of Natural History, his language is our language, and his methods and his problems are wellnigh identical with our own. He had familiar knowledge of a thousand varied forms of life, of bird and beast, and plant and creeping thing. He was careful to note their least details of outward structure, and curious to probe by dissection into their parts within. He studied the metamorphoses of gnat and butterfly, and opened the bird's egg to find the mystery of incipient life in the embryo chick. He

¹ Pursuing my geographical inquiries a very little further, I have discovered that of the very large number of place-names mentioned in the *Problems*, by far the greater number are situated in Southern Italy, that is to say in Magna Graecia, or in Sicily ; and I live in hopes of seeing this work, or a very large portion of it, expunged, for this and other weightier reasons, from the canonical writings of Aristotle. In the treatise *De Plantis*, which is already acknowledged to be spurious, only three or four geographical names, I think, occur ; but they likewise are every one of them situated within the bounds of Magna Graecia.

recognized great problems of biology that are still ours to-day, problems of heredity, of sex, of nutrition and growth, of adaptation, of the struggle for existence, of the orderly sequence of Nature's plan. Above all he was a student of Life itself. If he was a learned anatomist, a great student of the dead, still more was he a lover of the living. Evermore his world is in movement. The seed is growing, the heart beating, the frame breathing. The ways and habits of living things must be known : how they work and play, love and hate, feed and procreate, rear and tend their young ; whether they dwell solitary, or in more and more organized companies and societies. All such things appeal to his imagination and his diligence. Even his anatomy becomes at once an *anatomia animata*, as Haller, poet and physiologist, described the science to which he gave the name of *physiology*. This attitude towards life, and the knowledge got thereby, afterwards helped to shape and mould Aristotle's philosophy.

I have no reason to suppose that the study of biology 'maketh a man wise', but I am sure it helped to lead Aristotle on the road to wisdom. Nevertheless he takes occasion to explain, or to excuse, his devotion to this study, alien, seemingly, to the pursuit of philosophy. 'Doubtless,' he says,¹ 'the glory of the heavenly bodies fills us with more delight than we get from the contemplation of these lowly things ; for the sun and stars are born not, neither do they decay, but are eternal and divine. But the heavens are high and afar off, and of celestial things the knowledge that our senses give us is scanty and dim. On the other hand, the living creatures are nigh at hand, and of each and all of them we may gain ample and certain knowledge if we so desire.

¹ *De Part. Anim.* i. 5.

If a statue please us, shall not the living fill us with delight ; all the more if in the spirit of philosophy we search for causes and recognize the evidences of design. Then will Nature's purpose and her deep-seated laws be everywhere revealed, all tending in her multitudinous work to one form or another of the Beautiful.' In somewhat similar words does Bacon¹ retranslate a familiar saying : 'He hath made all things beautiful according to their seasons ; also he hath submitted the world to man's inquiry.' On the other hand, a most distinguished philosopher of to-day is struck, and apparently perplexed, by 'the awkward and grotesque, even the ludicrous and hideous forms of some plants and animals'.² I commend him, with all respect, to Aristotle—or to that Aristotelian verity given us in a nutshell by Rodin, 'Il n'y a pas de laideur !'

To be sure, Aristotle's notion of beauty was not Rodin's. He had a philosopher's comprehension of the Beautiful, as he had a great critic's knowledge and understanding of Poetry ; but wise and learned as he was, he was neither artist nor poet. His style seldom rises, and only in a few such passages as that which I have quoted, above its level didactic plane. Plato saw philosophy, astronomy, even mathematics, as in a vision ; but Aristotle does not know this consummation of a dream. The bees have a king, with Aristotle. Had Plato told us of the kingdom of the bees, I think we should have had Shakespearian imagery. The king would have had his 'officers of sorts', his magistrates, and soldiers, his 'singing masons building roofs of gold'. Even Pliny, arid encyclopaedist as he is, can now and then throb and thrill us as Aristotle cannot do—for example, when

¹ *De Sapientia Veterum* (Eccles. iii. 11).

² Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

he throws no little poetry and still more of music into his description of the nightingale's song.¹

But let us now come, at last, to exemplify, by a few brief citations, the nature and extent of Aristotle's zoological knowledge. And here, brevity bids me choose between two ways: either to deal with Aristotle's theories or his facts, his insight or his erudition. The former are of the highest possible interest to us, and their treatment partly includes the latter. But it would take more than all the time I have, to deal with any one of Aristotle's theories—of generation, for instance, or of respiration and vital heat, or those still weightier themes of variation and heredity, the central problems of biology, or again the teleological questions of adaptation and design.

Let me therefore confine myself, almost wholly, to a few fragments out of his storehouse of zoological and embryological facts.

Among the bloodless animals, as Aristotle called what we call the Invertebrates, he distinguishes four great genera, and of these the Molluscs are one. These are the cuttle-fish, which have now surrendered their Aristotelian name of 'molluscs' to that greater group, which is seen to include them with the shell-fish, or 'ostracoderma' of Aristotle. These cuttle-fishes are creatures that we seldom see, but in the Mediterranean they are an article of food, and many kinds are known to the fishermen. All, or wellnigh all, of these common kinds were known to Aristotle, and his account of them has come down to us with singular completeness. He describes their form and their anatomy, their habits, their development, all with such faithful accuracy that what we can add to-day seems of secondary importance. He begins with

¹ *H. N.* x. 43 (29).

a methodical description of the general form, tells us of the body and fins, of the eight arms with their rows of suckers, of the abnormal position of the head. He points out the two long arms of *Sepia* and of the *Calamaries*, and their absence in the octopus ; and he tells us, what was only confirmed of late, that with these two long arms the creature clings to the rock and sways about like a ship at anchor. He describes the great eyes, the two big teeth forming the beak ; and he dissects the whole structure of the gut, with its long gullet, its round crop, its stomach and the little coiled caecal diverticulum ; dissecting not only one but several species, and noting differences that were not observed again till Cuvier re-dissected them. He describes the funnel and its relation to the mantle-sac, and the ink-bag, which he shows to be largest in *Sepia* of all others. And here, by the way, he seems to make one of those apparent errors that, as it happens, turn out to be justified : for he tells us that in *Octopus* the funnel is on the upper side ; the fact being that when the creature lies prone upon the ground, with all its arms spread and flattened out, the funnel-tube (instead of being flattened out beneath the creature's prostrate body) is long enough to protrude upwards between arms and head, and to appear on one side or other thereof, in a position apparently the reverse of its natural one. He describes the character of the cuttle-bone in *Sepia*, and of the horny pen which takes its place in the various *Calamaries*, and notes the lack of any similar structure in *Octopus*. He dissects in both sexes the reproductive organs, noting without exception all their essential and complicated parts ; and he had figured these in his lost volume of anatomical diagrams. He describes the various kinds of eggs, and, with still more surprising knowledge, shows us the little embryo cuttle-fish, with its great

yolk-sac, attached (in apparent contrast to the chick's) to the little creature's developing head.

But there is one other remarkable structure that he knew, centuries before it was rediscovered almost in our own time. In certain male cuttle-fishes, in the breeding season, one of the arms develops in a curious fashion into a long coiled whip-lash, and in the act of breeding may then be transferred to the mantle-cavity of the female. Cuvier himself knew nothing of the nature or the function of this separated arm, and indeed, if I am not mistaken, it was he who mistook it for a parasitic worm. But Aristotle tells us of its use and its temporary development, and of its structure in detail, and his description tallies closely with the accounts of the most recent writers.

Among the rarer species of the group he knew well the little Argonaut, with its beautiful cockle-shell, and tells how it puts up its two broad arms to sail with, a story that has been rejected by many, but that after all may perhaps be true.

Now in all this there is far more than a mass of fragmentary information gleaned from the fishermen. It is a plain orderly treatise, on the ways and habits, the varieties, and the anatomical structure of an entire group. Till Cuvier wrote there was none so good, and Cuvier lacked knowledge that Aristotle possessed.

Not less exact and scarcely less copious is the chapter in which Aristotle deals with the crab and lobster, and all such crustacean shell-fish, nor that in which he treats of insects, after their kind. Most wonderful of all, perhaps, are those portions of his books in which he speaks of fishes, their diversities, their structure, their wanderings, and their food. Here we may read of fishes that have only recently been rediscovered,¹ of structures

¹ e.g. *Parasilurus Aristotelis*, a siluroid fish of the Achelous.

only lately reinvestigated, of habits only of late made known.¹ And many such anticipations of our knowledge, and many allusions to things of which we are perhaps still ignorant, may yet be brought to light ; for we are still far from having interpreted and elucidated the whole mass of Aristotle's recorded erudition : which whole recorded mass is only, after all, *tanquam tabula naufragii*.

There is perhaps no chapter in the *Historia Animalium* more attractive to the anatomist than one which deals with the anatomy and mode of reproduction of the cartilaginous fishes, the sharks and rays, a chapter which moved to admiration that prince of anatomists Johannes Müller.² The latter wrote a volume on the text of a page of Aristotle, a page packed full of a multitude of facts, in no one of which did Johannes Müller discover a flaw. The subject is technical, but the gist of the matter is this : that among these Selachians (as, after Aristotle, we still sometimes call them) there are many diversities in the structure of the parts in question, and several distinct modes in which the young are brought forth or matured. For in many kinds an egg is laid, which eggs, by the way, Aristotle describes with great minuteness. Other kinds do not lay eggs, but bring forth their young alive, and these include the Torpedo and numerous sharks or dogfish. The eggshell is in these cases very thin, and breaks before the birth of the young. But among them there are a couple of sharks, of which one species was within

¹ e.g. the reproduction of the pipe-fishes (Syngnathi), the hermaphrodite nature of the Serrani, the nest-building of the Wrasses, &c., &c.

² Cf. Cavolini, in his classical *Mem. sulla Generazione dei Pesci*, Naples, 1787 : 'E quando io . . . scorro la Storia degli Animali di Aristotile, non posso non essere da stupore preso, in esse leggendo veduti quei fatti, che a noi non si son potuti che a stento manifestare : e rilevati poi con tutta la nettezza, e posti in parallelo coi fatti già riconosciuti nel feto del gallo ;' &c.

Aristotle's reach, where a very curious thing happens. Through the delicate membrane, which is all that is left of the eggshell, the great yolk-sac of the embryo becomes connected with the parental tissues, which infold and interweave with it ; and by means of this temporary union the blood of the parent becomes the medium of nourishment for the young. And the whole arrangement is physiologically identical with what obtains in the higher animals, the mammals, or warm-blooded vivipara. It is true that the yolk-sac is not identical with that other embryonic membrane which comes in the mammals to discharge the function of which I speak ; but Aristotle was aware of the difference, and distinguishes the two membranes with truth and accuracy.

It happens that of the particular genus of sharks to which this one belongs, there are two species differing by almost imperceptible characters ; but it is in one only of the two, the γαλῆδος λεῖος of Aristotle, that this singular phenomenon of the *placenta vitellina* is found. It is found in the great blue shark of the Atlantic and the Mediterranean ; but this creature grows to a very large size before it breeds, and such great specimens are not likely to have come under Aristotle's hands. Cuvier detected the phenomenon in the blue shark, but paid little attention to it, and, for all his knowledge of Aristotle, did not perceive that he was dealing with an important fact which the Philosopher had studied and explained. In the seventeenth century, the anatomist Steno actually rediscovered the phenomenon, in the γαλῆδος λεῖος, the *Mustelus laevis* itself, but he was unacquainted with Aristotle. And the very fact was again forgotten until Johannes Müller brought it to light, and showed not only how complete was Aristotle's account, but how wide must have been his survey of this class of fishes to enable

him to record this peculiarity in its relation to their many differences of structure and reproductive habit. I used to think of this phenomenon as one that Aristotle might have learned from the fishermen, but, after a more careful study of Johannes Müller's book, I am convinced that this is not the case. It was a discovery that could only have been made by a skilled and learned anatomist.

In a lengthy and beautiful account Aristotle describes the development of the chick. It is on the third day that the embryo becomes sufficiently formed for the modern student to begin its study, and it was after just three days (a little earlier, as Aristotle notes, in little birds, a little later in larger ones) that Aristotle saw the first clear indication of the embryo. Like a speck of blood, he saw the heart beating, and its two umbilical blood-vessels breaking out over the yolk. A little later he saw the whole form of the body, noting the disproportionate size of head and eyes, and found the two sets of blood-vessels leading, the one to the yolk-sac, the other to the new-formed allantois. In the tiny chick of the tenth day, he saw the stomach and other viscera ; he noted the altered position of the heart and great blood-vessels ; he traced clearly and fully the surrounding membranes ; he opened the little eye to seek, but failed to find, the lens. And at length he describes in detail the appearance and attitude of the little chick, the absorption of the yolk, the shrivelling of the membranes, just at the time when the little bird begins to chip the shell, and before it steps out into the world. While this epitome contains but a part of what Aristotle saw (and without a lens it would be hard to see more than he), it includes the notable fact of the early appearance of the heart, the *punctum saliens* of later writers, whose precedence of all other organs was a chief reason for Aristotle's attributing to it a common,

central, or primary sense, and so locating in it the central seat of the soul. And so it was held to be till Harvey's time, who, noting the contemporaneous appearance of heart and blood, held that the contained was nobler than that which contained it, and that it was the blood that was 'the fountain of life, the first to live, the last to die, the primary seat of the soul, the element in which, as in a fountain-head, the heat first and most abounds and flourishes'; so harking back to a physiology more ancient than Aristotle's—'for the blood is the life thereof.' All students of the *Timaeus* know that here Aristotle parted company with Plato, who, following Hippocrates, and Democritus, and others, placed the seat of sensation, the sovereign part of the soul, in the brain. Right or wrong, it was on observation, and on his rarer use of experiment,¹ that Aristotle relied. The wasp or the centipede still lives when either head or tail is amputated, the tortoise's heart beats when removed from the body, and the heart is the centre from which the blood-vessels spring. To these arguments Aristotle added the more idealistic belief that the seat of the soul, the ruling force of the body, must appropriately lie in the centre: and he found further confirmation of this view from a study of the embryo plant, where in the centre, between the seed-leaves, is the point from which stem and root grow. And Ogle reminds us how, until a hundred years ago, botanists still retained an affectionate and superstitious regard for that portion of the plant, calling it now *cor*, now *cerebrum*, the plant's heart or brain.

And now is it possible to trace directly the influence of Aristotle's scientific training and biological learning upon

¹ Aristotle's experiments were akin to Voltaire's, who employed himself in his garden at Ferney in cutting off the horns and heads of snails, to see whether, or how far, they grew again.

his sociology, his psychology, or in general on his philosophy? That such an influence must have been at work is, *prima facie*, obvious. The physician who becomes a philosopher will remain a physician to the end; the engineer will remain an engineer; and the ideas of pure mathematics, Roger Bacon's 'alphabet of philosophy', will find issue and expression in the philosophy of such mathematicians as Plato, Leibnitz, Spinoza, or Descartes. Moreover, it is not only the special training or prior avocation of the philosopher that so affects his mind. In divers historical periods the rapid progress or the diffused study of a particular science has moulded the philosophy of the time. So on a great scale in the present day does biology; so did an earlier phase of evolutionary biology affect Hegel; and in like manner, in the great days after Lavoisier, the days of Dalton, Davy and Berzelius, did chemistry help, according to John Stuart Mill, to suggest a 'chemistry of the mind' to the 'association' psychologists. A certain philosopher,¹ in dealing with this theme, begins by telling us that 'Mathematics was the only science that had outgrown its merest infancy among the Greeks'. Now it is my particular purpose to-day to show, from Aristotle, that this is not the case. Whether Aristotle's biological forerunners were many or few, whether or not the Hippocratics (for instance) had failed to raise physiology and anatomy to the dignity of a science, or having done so, had only reserved them, as a secret cult, to their own guild; in short, whether Aristotle's knowledge is in the main the outcome of his solitary labours, or whether, as Leibnitz said of Descartes, *praeclare in rem suam vertit aliorum cogitata*, it is at least certain that biology was in his hands a true and comprehensive science, only second to the mathematics of his age.

¹ Ritchie, *Darwin and Hegel*, p. 39.

The influence, then, of scientific study, and in particular of Biology, is not far to seek in Aristotle's case. It has ever since been a commonplace to compare the state, the body politic, with an organism, but it was Aristotle who first employed the metaphor. Again, in his exhaustive accumulation and treatment of political facts, his method is that of the observer, of the scientific student, and is in the main inductive. Just as, in order to understand fishes, he gathered all kinds together, recording their forms, their structure, and their habits, so he did with the Constitutions of cities and of states. Those two hundred and more *πολιτεῖαι* which Aristotle laboriously compiled, after a method of which Plato would never have dreamed, were to form a Natural History of Constitutions and Governments. And if we see in his concrete, objective treatment of the theme a kinship with Spencer's Descriptive Sociology, again, I think, a difference is soon apparent, between Spencer's colder catalogue of facts and Aristotle's more loving insight into the doings and into the hearts, into the motives and the ambitions, of men.

But whatever else Aristotle is, he is the great Vitalist, the student of the Body with the Life thereof, the historian of the Soul.

Now we have already seen how and where Aristotle fixed the soul's seat and local habitation. But the soul has furthermore to be studied according to its attributes, or analysed into its 'parts'. Its attributes can be variously analysed, as in his *Ethics* Aristotle shows. But it is in the light of Biology alone that what amounts to a scientific analysis, such as is developed in the *De Anima*, becomes possible; and in that treatise it is only after a long preliminary physiological discussion that Aristotle at length formulates his distinctive psychology. There is a principle of continuity, a *συνέχεια*, that runs

through the scale of structure in living things, and so, little by little, by imperceptible steps, does Nature make the passage from plant, through animal, to man. It is with all the knowledge, summarized in a great passage of the *Natural History*, and embodied in this broad generalization, that Aristotle afterwards proceeds to indicate the same gradation in psychology, and to draw from it a kindred classification of the Soul.

There is a soul which presides over the primary physiological requirement of nutrition, a soul already inherent in the plant and inseparable from life itself; it is ἡ πρώτη ψυχή. Common likewise to all living things are the physiological functions of growth and reproduction, and the psychical agencies directing these are concomitant with, and in fact identical with, the nutrient soul. Sensation or sensibility, whereby the animal essentially differs from the plant, distinguishes the αἰσθητικὴ ψυχή, the sentient soul; and the soul of movement, undisplayed in the very lowest of animals, presently accompanies the soul of sensibility. At length the reasoning soul, the διανοητικὴ ψυχή, or νοῦς, emerges in man, as the source of his knowledge and his wisdom.¹ In a brief but very important passage,² with a touch of that Platonic idealism never utterly forgotten by him (and so apt to bring Wordsworth to our own minds), Aristotle tells us that this soul 'cometh from afar'—μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισιέναι, καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον. Yes, in very plain Greek prose, this is no less than to assert that 'trailing clouds of glory', 'it cometh from afar.'

But however glorified be the reasoning soul, yet these parts, these subdivisions of the soul, do not stand apart in

¹ I have here borrowed some words from a former address, and from my notes on the *Historia Animalium*.

² *De Gen. An.* ii. 3, 736 b 27. Cf. Brentano, *Aristoteles' Lehre vom Ursprung des menschlichen Geistes*, 1911, p. 18.

mutual exclusiveness, but just as we may discern a triangle within a square, so is each lower grade of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ implicit in the higher. And as the higher organisms retain the main physiological faculties of the lower, so do they retain such psychological qualities as these possess: and gradually (more and more as we ascend the ladder) do we find adumbrations of the psychical qualities that will be perfected in the higher forms. Among the higher animals, at least, a comparative psychology may be developed; for just as their bodily organs are akin to one another's and to man's, so also have we in animals an inchoate intelligence, wherein we may study, in one or another, the psychology of such things as fear, anger, courage, and at length of something which we may call sagacity, which stands not far from reason. And, last of all, we have a psychology of childhood, wherein we study in the child, at first little different from the animal, the growing seeds of the mind of man.

But observe before we leave this subject that, though Aristotle follows the comparative method, and ends by tracing in the lower forms the phenomena incipient in the higher, he does not adopt the method so familiar to us all, and on which Spencer insisted, of first dealing with the lowest, and of studying in successive chronological order the succession of higher forms. The historical method, the realistic method of the nineteenth century, the method to which we so insistently cling, is not the only one. Indeed, even in modern biology, if we compare (for instance) the embryology of to-day with that of thirty years ago, we shall see that the pure historical method is relaxing something of its fascination and its hold. Rather has Aristotle continually in mind the highest of organisms, in the light of whose integral and constituent phenomena must the less perfect be understood. So was

it with one whom the Lord Chancellor of England has called 'the greatest master of abstract thought since Aristotle died'. For Hegel,¹ as surely for Aristotle also, *Entwicklung* was not a 'time-process but a thought-process'. To Hegel, an actual, realistic, outward, historical evolution seemed but a clumsy and materialistic philosophy of nature. In a sense, the 'time-difference has no interest for thought'. And if the lower animals help us to understand ourselves, it is in a light reflected from the study of Man.

So grows up, upon a broad basis of Natural History, the whole psychology of Aristotle, and in particular that great doctrine of the tripartite soul, according to which created things 'by gradual change sublimed, To vital spirits aspire, to animal, To intellectual !'

In this $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ of Aristotle there was (in spite of the passage which I have quoted) a trace of the concrete and the all but material, which later Greek as well as Christian thought was not slow to discern and to modify. But, as a philosopher of our own day reminds us, it was in relation to a somewhat idealized Body that Aristotle described that somewhat unspiritual Soul. Such as it is, it has remained at the roots of our psychology, even to this day.

Bergson only partially gets rid of it when he recasts Aristotelian psychology on the lines of that branching tree which modern evolutionary biology substitutes for the *scala Naturae* of Aristotle; and when he sees, for instance, in psychological evolution, not the successive grades of continuous development, through sensibility and instinct to intelligence, but rather the splitting up of an original activity, of which instinct

¹ Ritchie, op. cit. Cf. Höffding, in *Darwin and Modern Science*. Cambridge, 1909, p. 449.

and intelligence are not successive, but separate and diverging, outgrowths.

In our recent science the Aristotelian doctrine is not dead. For but little changed, though dressed in new garments, this Aristotelian *entelechy*,¹ which so fascinated Leibnitz,² enters into the Vitalism of Hans Driesch; and of those who believe with him, that far as physical laws may carry us, they do not take us to the end: that the limitations of induction forbid us to pass in thought and argument from chemistry to consciousness, or (as Spencer well knew) from Matter to Mind; ³ that Life is not merely 'an outstanding difficulty, but a veritable exception to the universal applicability of mechanical laws'; that not to be comprehended under the category of physical cause, but to be reckoned with apart, is the fundamental conception underlying Life and its Teleology.⁴

It is easy so to sketch in simple words the influence of Aristotle's biological studies upon his method of work, or to see in his Psychology and his Ethics the results of his biological analysis of the soul. But his natural science seems to send a still deeper influence running through the whole of his philosophy, for better or for worse, which

¹ ψυχή ἐστὶν ἐντελέχεια ἡ πρώτη σώματος φυσικοῦ δυνάμει ζῶν ἔχοντος.

² Cf. Jacoby, *De Leibnitii studiis Aristotelicis*, Berlin, 1867.

³ Cf. Spencer, *Princ. of Psychology* (para. 63): 'Though of the two it seems easier to translate so-called Matter into so-called Spirit, than to translate so-called Spirit into so-called Matter (which latter is indeed wholly impossible); yet no translation can carry us beyond our symbols. Such vague conceptions as loom before us are illusions conjured up by the wrong connotations of our words.'

⁴ Cf. Kant's views in the *Kritik der Urteilskraft* and elsewhere, on the teleological aspect of living organisms, with (for instance) Schleiden in the Preface to his *Grundzüge der Botanik* (1860): '... durch die Darwinsche Lehre die Teleologie aus der Naturwissenschaft vollständig heraus, und in die erbauliche oder poetische Rede, wo sie hingehört, verwiesen wurde!' Cf. also Professor Sidgwick's remarks on Spencer's 'avoidance of teleological explanation', in the *Ethics* of T. H. Green, &c., p. 141.

influence I lack the needful learning to fathom and to describe. I can only see dimly, and cannot venture to explain, how his lifelong study of living things led to his rejection of Plato's idealistic ontology, and affected his whole method of classification, his notion of essentials and accidents, his idea of 'Nature' that 'makes nothing in vain', his whole analysis of causation, his belief in, and his definition¹ of, Necessity, his faith in design, his particular form of teleology, his conception and apprehension of God.

And now, to close my story. It is in no derogation of Spencer's commemorative honour that I have spoken of him together with a greater Philosopher, and one of the greatest of men. So I have used my hour of Oxford to speak, and to salute, the name of Aristotle, here where his spirit has dwelt for six hundred years—I who have humbly loved him since my day began.

We know that the history of biology harks back to Aristotle by a road that is straight and clear, but that beyond him the road is broken and the lights are dim. And we have seen that biology was no mere by-play of Aristotle's learned leisure, but was a large intrinsic part of the vast equipment of his mind.

This our science is no petty handicraft, no narrow discipline. It was great, and big, in Aristotle's hands, and it is grown gigantic since his day.

It begins in admiration of Nature's handiwork, as she strews it by the way. It bids us seek through the land, and search the deep places of the sea. It toils for the health and wealth of men. It speaks of things humble; it whispers of things high. It tells (if I dare use the old theologian's word²) of Laws, 'whose Voice is the harmony of the World, and whose Seat is the bosom of God.'

¹ τὸ μὴ ἐνδεχόμενον ἄλλως εἶχειν.

² Hooker.

Sometimes, as to-day, it brings us by a by-way to the study of the history of human thought and knowledge, and introduces us to a company of great men, dwellers in the 'clear air' of Athens.

The little Greek I know, first learnt at my Father's knee, is but a child's plaything to that of many a scholar here. But I hear, now and then, a welcome given, in old Hellenic speech, to men who call at that Interpreter's House wherein Plato and Aristotle show us 'excellent things, such as will be a help to us in our journey'.

OXFORD : HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Romances of Chivalry on Greek Soil

BEING THE ROMANES LECTURE FOR 1911

BY

J. B. BURY

HON. D.LITT. OXON

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

DELIVERED

IN THE SHELDONIAN THEATRE

25 MAY 1911

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1911

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

■

ROMANCES OF CHIVALRY ON GREEK SOIL

THE literary inheritance bequeathed by the ancient Greeks was not neglected by their posterity. It was held in such high honour that instead of being a source of inspiration it was allowed to exercise an intellectual tyranny. What the ancients had written on any subject except religion was invested with authority ; they were assumed to have exhausted the whole range of secular knowledge and to have achieved all that was feasible in the realm of profane literature. The mediaeval Greeks lived and thought, not only under the yoke of the Church and the Church's interpretation of the universe, but also under the yoke of their classical antiquity. Their own literary productions, those which they valued most, consisted of inferior imitations of ancient models. The men and women of the better classes enjoyed a classical education, but it was more conventional than—shall I say?—classical education has been among ourselves ; and while they did not succeed in penetrating into the spirit of pagan antiquity, they were unable to free themselves from the tyranny of their brilliant ancestors. Later Greek literature is the literature of men who were the slaves of tradition ; it was a bondage to noble masters, but still it was a bondage ; yet the prospect is relieved by some remarkable exceptions, to which I propose to invite your attention.

In a society tenacious of tradition and dominated by these two authorities—the incompatibility of which caused no embarrassment—we might expect that the most likely, if not the only, chance for the birth of fresh and original works of imagination would be impact and influence from another world, sufficiently strong and persistent and exciting. There was obviously an opportunity for influence of this kind in the last period of the history of the Byzantine Greeks, when they were overwhelmed, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, by the invasion of the Western knights, and Greece and the islands of the Aegean passed under the rule of Frenchmen and Italians. Throughout the three following centuries the two civilizations, Greek and Frank, were side by side. .

The Frank invaders, who thus settled in the midst of the Greeks, had the fully developed institutions of Western chivalry, and it was a matter of course that the new literature of the twelfth century which was so intimately associated with chivalry, the Provençal romances of adventure, and the tales of the Arthurian cycle, should have circulated at the courts of the barons who ruled in Hellenic lands. The poetry of the French romance writers proved its cosmopolitan quality by its reception in Germany, Italy, and England. Could it fail in Greece, where the external conditions for its reception seemed incomparably more favourable? Western women were not very numerous in the Frank colonies, and there was much intermarrying between the foreigners and Greek ladies. In this mixed society there followed, in the course of time, a demand for romances of love and chivalrous adventure in the Greek tongue, and the demand was partly met by adaptations of French poems. For instance, the story of Floire and Blanceflor, the romance of Pierre of Provence and

the fair Maguelonne, the Arthurian tale of Gyron le Courtois, were worked up in Greek. This fact entitles us to speak of a literary reception. Such versions and adaptations, however, do not constitute alone a reception of much value. But original poems of chivalrous adventure were also produced, and the character of these must decide in what measure the imagination of the Greeks was affected by the foreign literature which had come their way. If we take as a sort of standard the intellectual conquest of Rome by Greece, the greatest perhaps of all literary receptions, did their acquaintance with Western romances move the Greeks to produce works impregnated with Western ideas in the same way as the Odes of Horace or the Eclogues and Aeneid of Virgil are charged with the influence of their Hellenic masters? Or to take a lesser example, did French romance inspire Greek poets as it inspired Teutonic singers like Wolfram and Gottfried?

Let me take a romance of adventure and love, composed by a nameless Greek in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, the story of *Belthandros and Chrysaniza*. The poem is short, about as long as two books of Homer, and the plot is slight enough. The Emperor Rhodophilus has two purple-born sons, Philarmos and Belthandros, who are devoted to each other. The younger, Belthandros, is remarkable for his beauty and bravery, his prowess in hunting, and his skill in archery. But his father has taken a dislike to him, and treats him with intolerable rigour. The slights which are put upon him furnish the motive for his decision to leave his country and seek adventures in foreign lands. In spite of his brother's tearful dissuasions he rides forth with three attendants, and on the first night he pitches his tent in a meadow lit by a full moon, and, taking his lute, utters in song his sadness, and a vague foreboding that

some strange secret of destiny is awaiting him. Overtaken here by men whom his father has sent to bring him back, when they threaten to use force he slays ten of them. Continuing his journey through the kingdom of the Turks in Asia Minor, he has an adventure with brigands, and reaches Tarsus. In this neighbourhood he comes one day to a small stream, and sees a star-like flame dancing in the water. His curiosity excited at this strange apparition, he determines to discover the source, and rides upstream for ten days. Then he comes to a magnificent castle, built of sardonyx, with a diamond gate. Above the portal he reads this inscription :

Of him, who never felt Love's dart,
A million shafts shall pierce the heart
If in the fortalice of Love
He see the inner halls thereof.

Belthandros thus learns that he has come to the Erotokastron, the Castle of Love. After long hesitation, he resolves that he cannot depart without fulfilling the quest and finding the source of the *phlogopotamon*, the flame-lit stream. Leaving the servants outside, he enters the court, which is radiant with flowers and trees. In the centre is an artificial fountain, and in the water which spouted through the lips of a griffin the mysterious flame again appears, as the griffin moves. The poet lingers with evident enjoyment over the artistic decorations of the castle, which resembles not the châteaux of Western Europe but the palaces of Byzantium. In the *triklinos* or great hall Belthandros solves the problem of the flame. He sees the fiery source issuing from the eyes of an image of sapphire. He notices an inscription on the image, and is amazed to read his own name. 'Belthandros,' said the writing, 'second son of Rhodophilus, the crowned lord of the Roman Empire, is pining for love of Chrysantza, daughter of the great

king of Antioch.' The young man was disturbed and dismayed to find that the stream's secret imported a secret of his own personal destiny, and he pitied himself exceedingly. He was thrown into deeper agitation when he discovered that another image, the heart of which was cleft by an arrow, bore another inscription, and its tenor was: 'Chrysantza, whose name has been inscribed by Fate, and Belthandros, these two Love has parted asunder.' Repenting the hour in which he had come to the castle, he recognizes that he has seen the writing of Fate, his *μοιρογράφημα*, and resigns himself to the exploration of all the bitter and sweet beauties of Love's palace—

τὰς μικρογλυκοχάριτας τοῦ Ἐρωτοκάστρου τούτου.

This *μοιρογράφημα*, the idea of a love predestined between two persons who had never seen each other, is the central idea of the poem.

Belthandros was still inspecting the courts of mystery when night fell, dark and moonless. A winged love suddenly hovered before him, and said, 'Come instantly, Belthandros, the Emperor calls thee.' He found the Emperor of the Loves seated on a throne, crowned and sceptred, a golden arrow in his hand. When he had told his story, the sovran said, 'I have forty noble women here, all royal ladies, daughters of kings, chosen for their beauty, and I desire thee, using thine own judgement, to pick out the fairest.' He gave Belthandros a wand of three substances, gold, iron, and ruby, to be bestowed on her whom he selected as the queen of all.

The prince then found himself alone, until he suddenly became aware of a company of forty beautiful women sitting outside the terrace. They came one by one to be inspected; and he told each of them her defect with brutal candour. The fortieth, of course, was perfect,

and received the rod. Summoned again to the presence of the master of the house to give an account of his judgement, he describes with rapture the charms of the lady to whom he awarded the prize. 'She fell,' he said, 'from the arms of the moon, robbing her of her radiance.' When he had finished, Love and his attendant train, and the forty women, vanished, and Belthandros made his way out of the castle and rode off with his servants.

This beauty-show was not borrowed, so far as we know, from any literary predecessor, nor need we suppose that the author was indebted to the ancient judgement of Mount Ida. He has simply translated into fiction the old Byzantine custom of the bride-show. At one period the young emperors used to marry not foreign princesses, who were regarded as barbarians, but Greek ladies; and for this purpose discreet messengers were sent into the provinces to discover maidens who were well educated and refined, and conformed to a certain canon of beauty. These agents were provided with measures—the measure, for instance, of the ideal foot. All the girls who were chosen assembled on a certain day in the palace at Constantinople, and the bride was selected by the young man, generally under the auspices of his mother. The judgement of beauty in the Castle of Love is a Byzantine bride-show in a Byzantine palace.

The sequel of the future of Belthandros can be briefly told. He reaches Antioch, and enters the service of the king. Here we have come into a dominion where the feudal system prevails. Belthandros has to become the king's *lizios*—the Greek form of 'liegeman'. The king is a *ρῆγας*, his wife is a *ρῆγινα*; for the title Basileus was strictly reserved for the emperor. It is clear that the poet conceives Antioch as a Frank dominion, but he does not say so; he leaves this vague, and the king's

daughter, Chrysantza, has a Greek name. Belthandros recognizes her as the maiden to whom he had awarded the wand, and she, too, recognizes him ; for the poet conceives that she was actually present on that night in the Castle of Love. For more than four years they woo each other by secret signs ; at last they meet in a garden and declare their love. When he leaves her, Belthandros, who had no right to enter the garden, is arrested by the guards who were set to keep watch over the princess. The danger which threatened the prince at this discovery is diverted by a device of Chrysantza. Her devoted maid, Phaidrokaza, pretends that Belthandros had entered the forbidden precincts for a tryst with herself ; and the king immediately arranges a marriage between his liegeman and his daughter's maid. For nearly a year Belthandros carried on his amour with the mistress under cover of his marriage with her servant, and no one else knew of the matter except his own squires. But he became uneasy ; he feared that the business might leak out, and he induced Chrysantza to fly with him. Accompanied by their faithful attendants, they escaped from the palace one dark and stormy night. In crossing a swollen river the servants and horses were drowned, and the hero and heroine were washed ashore on opposite banks. Each thinks that the other is dead. Wandering along the edge, Chrysantza comes on the body of one of the men ; the features are defaced, but as the clothes and sword of Belthandros are near she believes that the corpse is his, and is about to kill herself when she hears his voice in the distance calling her by name. He swims across, and they make their way down the river to the sea-coast. A ship is approaching. It is a Greek ship, bearing a search party sent by the Emperor Rhodophilus to search the world for Belthandros. His

B

elder son had recently died, and he had set his heart on discovering the younger, who was now heir to the throne. Thus Belthandros returned to his native country and was duly married to the heroine.

In this romance the machinery is the most striking part, and occupies the central place. The Castle of Love, which Belthandros finds near such a familiar place as Tarsus, is undisguised magic—like the forest of Broceliande, or the castle in which Parzival saw the Holy Grail. This magic is more satisfactory than if the experience had been represented as a dream. An improbable dream is less interesting than make-believe reality, provided the illusion is well managed, and this poet has managed it with skill. The idea of the *phlogopotamon*, the mystery of the flame glancing on the water, which draws Belthandros to the abode of Love, gives his romance a certain poetical distinction. But the machinery is too large and impressive for the rest of the story; we feel that the plot, as it is worked out, is too slight to justify the elaboration of the machinery. In particular, the prediction which Belthandros read in the Castle of Love, that he and Chrysantza would be sundered apart, is fulfilled by their separation for a few hours on the opposite sides of a river. There is here an inartistic disproportion between the prophecy and the event. There is, too, an almost insolent carelessness in allowing the crude coincidence, by which Belthandros and Chrysantza reach the seashore at the very moment when his father's ship is approaching.

The poem is Greek from beginning to end, in its setting, its descriptions, its ideas. There is nothing in it which we can say must have been due to Western influence. The poet is acquainted with the feudal relations of liegeman and lord, as every Greek was in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But the

Frankish element enters so little into the texture of the story that even the heroine, who ought to have a Latin name, is called Chrysantza, and described as purple born. It has been ingeniously suggested that Belthandros and Rhodophilus are transformations of the names Bertrand and Rudolf, but the poet, as if to show that he is not drawing upon Western literature, intimates expressly that the names are Greek—and so they are.¹ At the same time, Greek though the poem is, it has an unmistakable kinship with the French *romans d'aventure*.

Another poem of chivalry, *Lybistros and Rhodamne*, has a very similar motif. The general gist of the argument may be stated in a sentence. It was revealed to Lybistros in a dream that he is destined to wed Rhodamne, whose fate is revealed in like manner to her; he discovers and wins her; then they are separated by magical means, and in the end he finds her again. This is the groundwork; but the construction is intricate and the poem in every way more elaborate than the tale of Belthandros. The first thing to be noticed is that the poet is expressly sympathetic with the world of Latin chivalry. The hero is conceived as a Latin prince, and wears Latin costume. The heroine, daughter of an Indian king, admires Frank customs. The name of the hero's rival, a king of Egypt, is Berderichos, that is, Bertrich; and the claim of the two suitors for Rhodamne's hand is decided by a tournament.

The love-making of Lybistros and Rhodamne by correspondence forms a substantial part of the story. The lover has to attach his letters to arrows and shoot them into the garden of the princess. Some of the letters are

¹ If the poem was written in Rhodes (a possible supposition) the choice of the name Rhodophilus for the imaginary Basileus would be explained.

charming in their way, but they lack the subtlety which would please the 'ladies who have intelligence in love' of France and Italy. I may take as a specimen the first letter that Rhodamne wrote to her lover:—

'I shrieked it to heaven, I told it to the clouds, I made earth my witness and the air, that never would I bow my neck beneath the bond of love. And now—my unbending purpose has been bent, my pride subdued, the plan of my behaviour changed. The freedom of my will I have made thy bonds slave. I forswear from this hour the oath I made to heaven, the sacred oath I swore to the clouds. I avow it, and I write thee this my letter,—no small thing I deem it.'

The correspondence is somewhat too long, but the author has introduced an element wanting in *Belthandros*, where the interest turns entirely on the adventures.

The fatality of Love is a central idea as in *Belthandros*, and his destiny is revealed to Lybistros by the same kind of machinery. There can indeed be hardly a doubt that the poet knew *Belthandros* and borrowed the device. But he has avoided the error of allowing it a disproportionate place in his story, and he has so sophisticated it that it has a different poetical value. Lybistros, too, visits the fortress and gardens of Love; but there is no magic; he visits them in dreams; and the mansion, which is called Erotokratia, is pervaded by an atmosphere of allegory. Love himself assumes three forms—of a child, a man in his prime, and an old man; and he is surrounded by allegorical figures, Agape ('Affection'), Pothos ('Longing'), Kremasmos ('Suspense'). Thus, instead of the illusion of reality, successfully achieved in *Belthandros*, we have here allegory and dream. Moreover, while in *Belthandros* love is accepted simply as an irresistible power, here its claims are defended on philosophical grounds. Its cult is vindicated. The ideal hero must be trained in the school of love,

ἐρωτοπαιδευμένος, and he who denies its claims is χωρικός—rustic or provincial.

The Erotokratia of this poem cannot fail to remind us of the close, surrounded by castled walls, in the Romance of the Rose. It, too, is a dream-castle, peopled with allegorical figures; the dreamer, like Lybistros, is a scorner of Love, and like him makes complete submission to the god. This mansion, in which Love dwelled, was not an invention of the thirteenth-century poet William de Lorris. He owed it, as M. Langlois has shown, to older poems in which a garden and palace of Love were described, especially the fableau of *Dieu d'amours* and the *Altercation of Phyllis and Flora*; and in the *Dieu d'amours*; as in *Lybistros* and the Romance of the Rose, the divine place is seen in a dream. These works establish that the idea of a beautiful dwelling of Love appeared in French literature in the twelfth century.¹ But we may safely say that this idea did not travel from the West to the East. The courts to which Belthandros wandered, and of which Lybistros dreamed, have no features which a Greek poet need have looked abroad

¹ M. Langlois thinks that the idea was suggested by lines of Tibullus (i. 3, 58):—

Ipsa Venus campos ducet in Elysios.
hic choreae cantusque uigent passimque uagantes
dulce sonant tenui gutture carmen aues, &c.

Compare, in the *Altercatio Phyllidis et Florae*,

sonant omnes uolucrum linguae uoce plena, &c.

I may point out, as some support for the conjecture, that in the *Dieu d'amours* Love's abode is called *Champ fleuri*. Now, in *Floire et Blanceflor*, when Floire supposes that Blanceflor is dead, he says (l. 777):

M'ame la m'amie sivra,
En *camp-flori* la trovera
Ou el queut encontre moi flors.

This perhaps supplies the link.

to invent. And in other Greek poems of the same period, where there is no question of Western influence, we find castles of allegorical persons—the Castle of Misfortune, the Castle of Sophrosyne.¹ I may add that the device of supernatural machinery for bringing lovers together probably goes back to Callimachus. It seems to have been through the deliberate intervention of the god Eros that Acontius and Cydippe met each other at the festival of Delos.

But what shall we say of the vision of Lybistros? Has it any obligation to the visions of the French dreamers? We need not think so. The revelation of two lovers to one another by means of dreams is an ancient Oriental motif, which was introduced into Greek literature by Chares in the days of Alexander the Great. And as to the other resemblance—the defiant sentiment which Lybistros and Rodamne, and the hero of the Romance of the Rose entertained towards Love—this furnishes no case for the assumption of borrowing. The subjugation of scorners of Love is an ancient motif, which the French derived from the old Latin poets, and which had never disappeared from Greek fiction. In another curious Greek romance of the same period, the love-story of *Achilles*, we also find the idea of defiance followed by submission. Like Lybistros, Achilles is at first an Hippolytus who scorns Love and is then subdued by him, but without the help of machinery. In this poem, also, the interest of the Greek poet in Western chivalry is undisguised. The cheeks of the son of Aphrodite and Peleus are shaven in the manner of the Franks; he unhorses a Frank cavalier whom none of the Greeks could

¹ See Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, ed. 2, p. 860.

master. The heroine Polyxena affected French costumes.

The imagination of these poets has been struck by some of the ways and fashions of the Franks, but all these Western touches are adventitious and decorative. That they are superimposed as ornament upon Greek stories is hardly concealed. Consider that the daughter of the Frank king of Antioch is named Chrysantza; consider that the Frank Lybistros has a name that is not Frank: consider, again, that the Indian king Chrysos and his daughter are Greeks in name and customs. A tournament (τῆδοστρα, 'joust') indeed is held at their court, but when Lybistros is promoted to be the colleague of his father-in-law the whole ceremony is Byzantine. Take the furniture of the tales. The descriptions of luxurious palaces and gardens, which are a conventional feature of these romances, presume the art and luxury of Byzantium. In the Tale of Achilles there is a golden plane-tree in the garden of Polyxena, with golden birds on the branches, each of which sings its own song. Singing birds of gold were also seen by Belthandros in the Castle of Love. A mechanism of this kind was one of the wonders in the palace of the emperors at Constantinople. But the taste for descriptions of gardens, marvellous fountains, and works of art has also a long literary tradition among the Greeks. It can be traced in the prose romances of the Alexandrine school—sometimes called the novels of the sophists—a species of literature which reaches back into the Hellenistic period and comes down to the twelfth century. These fantastic love-tales, with their antique flavour, had a decisive influence on the poems of which I am speaking.

So much for the staging and apparatus; they are Greek. What about the plots? Here the affinity to

many of the *romans d'aventure* is manifest. But there is not the least reason for supposing that the Greeks were indebted to Provence. On the contrary. Provence did not produce original fiction. Her poets only wrought up, in their inimitable manner, arguments which they derived from foreign sources. And chief among these sources were tales which circulated in the Greek and Oriental worlds, and which reached France not in books but by transmission from mouth to mouth—some, it has been conjectured, through Greek channels.¹ Such floating matter was shaped independently by the Greeks. We have an example in the adventurous romance of *Callimachus and Chrysorhoe*, written possibly by a member of the Palaeologus family towards the end of the thirteenth century; it can be shown that this poem was constructed out of various legends of enchantment which were current in Greece.

But there are other features in our romances which have still to be accounted for. We are in a sensibly different atmosphere from that of the Alexandrine novels. The heroes, Lybistros and his fellows, are not pseudo-antique figures, descendants of the young men who frequented the Hellenistic gymnasia; they are warriors, *καβαλλάριοι*, peers of the Western knights. Transfer them to Provence, and they would be at home with the heroes of troubadour fiction. The Greeks had no word for knight-errant, but they coined a verb which expresses a similar notion, *κοσμοαναγυρεύειν*, to roam the world on a quest. Must we then resort here to the hypothesis of Western influence and suppose that the Greek poets borrowed from the

¹ See M. Édélestand du Ménil's introduction to his edition of *Floire et Blanceflor* (1856).

Franks both the idea of a knight and the fantastic ideal of chivalrous adventure?

I think not. The *kavallarioi* of these romances have a different lineage. In prowess and manliness they rival the knights of the West; but they constitute no order; there is no institution of knighthood, none of the distinctive customs of Latin chivalry like the new knight's vigil over his arms. The Latin institution was not the model which produced the Greek ideal. For the Greeks already had their own. While Latin chivalry was developing into a social fact, under feudal conditions, *there was an analogous but perfectly independent development of a chivalrous ideal in the Greek-speaking world*, and to show this I must ask you to accompany me into a different field of literature.

Before the Crusades there was another experience, both persistent and exciting, which made a deep impression upon the Greeks—their experience of the world of Islam. An intercourse of many centuries, the commerce of war but also the commerce of peace, did not fail to lead to mutual influence of the Greek and Saracen civilizations. For generation after generation the tide of strife flowed backward and forward over the mountain barriers, and was the great imminent fact for the Christian population of Asia Minor. This perennial war and all it meant entered into their very soul. To hold the mountain passes—everything depended on that; and the commanders of frontier fortresses, Greek and Saracen, maintained continually a wild irregular warfare, full of surprises and adventurous incidents. These circumstances developed a new type of warrior, a *kavallarios*, whose heart was set on adventure and who was accustomed to act independently of orders from the emperor or a military superior. These watchers of the frontier were popularly

called *akritai* or hillsmen, and in the tenth century many of them possessed large domains and resembled feudal barons rather than Roman officers.

In this novel world, abounding in excitement, the popular imagination was touched into a creative effort. Hitherto men of Greek speech had only once been stirred by the epic impulse; they had produced only one popular epic cycle, the Homeric poems. The holy war with the Saracens led to the birth of another. The epic of *Digenes Akrites* is divided by an immeasurable interval in art from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; but it stands out in the history of Greek literature after Homer as the only national epic, and it has Homeric qualities. In Western Europe its name is hardly known; yet it has had its fortunes elsewhere. The *Nibelungenlied* exercised no influence on literature beyond Germany; the poem of *Digenes* had a career in the steppes of Russia.

This poem has no tragic interest in it, like the *Iliad*, or like that other epic of which the background is warfare with unbelievers, the *Song of Roland*. There is no catastrophe as in the *Odyssey*. It is a biography in which the incidents lead up to no culmination; the hero, stricken by a malady, ends his adventurous life peacefully in his bed. The cycle of stories from which the epic was constructed have perhaps their nearest parallel in the ballads in which the mythopoeic fancy of the Spaniards celebrated the possibly historical figure of the Cid. But though a central dramatic motif is wanting, the *Digenes* has an epic quality, which justifies us in naming it along with Homer and the *Nibelungenlied*—its comprehensiveness. As Homer reflects all sides of a certain stage of early Greek civilization, as the *Nibelungen* song mirrors the civilization of the Germans during the period of the migrations,

so the Digenes cycle presents a comprehensive picture of the Byzantine world in Asia Minor and of the frontier life. It is a cycle of popular tales which gathered round the figure of an ideal *akrites* or warden of the marches, and have come down to us as they were put together by some nameless poet in the shape of an epic. The hero is called Digenes, the man of two races, because his mother was a Greek, connected with historic families, and his father a Saracen emir who captured her in a raid and became for her love a Christian. Thus his name is symbolic of the mutual influence of the two hostile empires. His deeds of prowess begin at the age of twelve, when he slays a bear and a lion. His ambition is fired by the fame of the lawless bands of free-lances who lived in the frontier hills and were a terror not only to Moslems but to Christians, on both of whom they preyed. They were known as *apelatai* or drivers; we might translate the word by 'cattle-lifters'. Digenes destroyed or reduced these predatory hillsmen, and the Christians enjoyed peace. In love he was also triumphant. The rumour came to his ear of the wonderful beauty of Eudoxia, daughter of a governor of one of the provinces of Asia Minor. Her father kept her under lock and key, and the numerous suitors who attempted to carry her away paid the penalty with their lives. Digenes serenades her, wins her affection, and bears her off. Pursued by her father and brothers he overcomes their men, and forces the governor to consent to the marriage. His passionate devotion for this lady endures till death. He has other amorous adventures, like Odysseus, but the devotion of his heart to Eudoxia is not more seriously endangered by these episodes than the affection of the lover of Circe and Calypso for Penelope.

The emperor, who had heard of his wonderful exploits, paid him a visit in his palace on the Euphrates, and the description of this abode reflects the fashions of Byzantine luxury. The tone of their intercourse is significant. While Digenes formally professes himself a devoted servant, they meet far more as equals than as subject and servant. The warrior has a position of virtual independence, like that of a powerful Western baron.

Idyllic scenes—repose in pleasant shady meadows near waters—were a stereotyped feature in the Greek romances, and descriptions of such scenes were a conventional topic with Hellenistic rhetors. But they occur also in the epic. Digenes retired with his wife to a lovely meadow in which he pitched his tent. ‘The ground,’ he says, ‘was embroidered with radiant flowers. There were trees and tall reeds. A fresh spring welled in the midst of the meadow, and near it were deep pools in which the flowers and trees were reflected. The wood was full of birds which sang more sweetly than sirens; there were parrots on the boughs, swans on the water; peacocks displayed their plumage in rivalry of the flowers; but the brilliant beauty of the lady outshone the flowers and the birds.’¹ We may suspect that the epic poet was influenced here by sophistic fiction, but he has succeeded in investing with freshness a conventional scene.

While the violence and brutalities of the frontier warfare are not veiled, Digenes is portrayed as an accomplished cavalier, not only invincible in combat and insatiably eager for adventure, but courteous to ladies, modest about his own exploits, and, as M. Diehl has observed, capable of delicate emotions. He is the

¹ The epic has come down in different recensions, and the descriptions of this scene differ in elaboration.

prototype of the cavaliers of the romances. And not only in the ideal of the cavalier, but also in the treatment of love, the atmosphere of the romances has, we might say, been constituted by the atmosphere of the epic, though new ingredients have been added. In the epic, love is only one note, though a leading note; in the romances it is the main motif, and it is idealized, and dissociated from real life, and invested with mystery. The romancers have worked, as we saw, under the influence of the sophistic novelists; they have adopted some of the tricks of their masters; they have introduced the Hellenistic personification of Love—the irresistible king with deadly arrows, and the conception of heroes or heroines who at first defy the god. Now Hellenistic antiquity also influenced the French romances. The authors of the most typical French poems went back to ancient erotic literature, taking Ovid as their *doctor egregius* and his *Ars amatoria* as their scripture—*quasi evangelium*. But the Greek poets, who simply continued an unbroken tradition, did not, like the French, propound a new science of love. They did not subtilize the passion after the manner of the troubadours, or sophisticate it by any such refined doctrines as were woven around it by writers like Alan the Chaplain or expert ladies like the Countess Marie of Champagne, who acted as umpires in *affaires de cœur* and solved questions of amorous casuistry. Though the Greek romantic poets resorted to various devices, suggested by the Alexandrine novelists, to enhance the interest of their theme by mystery, though they made love more artificial, less naïve, yet, in the sentiment and the psychology, the epic exerted a supreme influence.

From all this it follows that there was a parallel development in French and Greek lands. As the French romances of the twelfth century had a mass of epic

poetry behind them, so the Greek romances of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had an epic background too. In both cases the treatment of romantic motives was affected by influences derived directly or indirectly from the Hellenistic world; in France, through deliberate recourse to Latin literature and especially Ovid; in Greece, through a literary tradition which had never died. If this parallelism is taken along with the fact that stories and motives travelled, by whatever devious ways, from the East to the West, it is not surprising that the Greek and some of the French romances should have a family likeness. For direct literary indebtedness we must wait till the sixteenth century, and visit the Island of Crete, where we shall find a certain Cornaro, a Hellenized Venetian, composing a long and tedious romance (the *Erotokritos*), which is saturated with Italian influence.

A few words may be said about the language and metre of the poems. Both the epic and the romances are composed in the colloquial language—I do not mean the rustic language, but the speech of educated people in contradistinction to the literary Greek which was employed in serious works. The metre is also the same. It is that form of verse which was most used in the popular poetry of the Middle Ages—alternate verses of eight and seven syllables modulated by accent and not by quantity. It is the metre of—

In Scarlet towne where I was born
There was a fair maid dwellin’.

In the period which we have been considering there was no rhyme. Rhyme afterwards came in, and its effect is unfortunate in longer poems; the jingle becomes insupportable. It is possible that this metre, which corresponds in beat to the iambic tetrameters of Greek

comedy, may have been the most suitable to the aptitudes of the language when the principle of quantity was abandoned for that of accent.

In the vocabulary and diction the influence of the epic is patent. But the romantic poets elaborated the style by devices. They cultivated the use of long epithets of seven or eight syllables which filled a whole verse, and they could appeal to classical literature for the propriety of this device. Such compounds occur occasionally in *Digenes*; they are a feature in the romances. Some of them become conventional, like *μυριοχαριτωμένος*, 'endued with a million graces,' or *ἡλιογεννημένη*, 'daughter of the sun.' They are often accumulated in descriptions of art and beauty, such epithets, for instance, as *κρυσταλλοχιονοτράχηλος*, 'with neck like crystal snow,' *στρογγυλεμορφοπούγουνη*, 'with round shapely chin.' The poet of Rhodamne converts her name into *Ἐρωτικο-ροδάμνη*—reminding us of *Liebröschen* or Love-lily.

If I may now briefly resume my argument, the Greeks already possessed, along with their own technique, all the ideas, material, and apparatus for romances of chivalry when the Western knights came and established themselves within their borders. And just on this account it is not surprising that, although the comingling of the two cultures, Western and Greek, afforded to the French literature of chivalry an unrivalled opportunity for exercising here the potency of charm which it wrought elsewhere, there was no result that can be compared, for instance, to the reception of French romances in Germany. The romantic literature of the West did not come as a new revelation to a people who possessed in their own literature motives, ideals, and a tradition of fantastic fiction which were in many respects homogeneous. Yet the close contact with the French and Italian settlers did exert an influence. I do

not mean merely that the ways and customs of the foreigners offered material to the Greek poets for decoration and accessory effects. I mean a provocative influence. There was a demand for fiction of the same class as the French romances, and Greek writers responded to it not only by versions, but also by original creations. These creations, however, are of Greek, not foreign parentage; they have a native, not a foreign tradition behind them—the mediaeval epic and the amorous fiction which originated in the Hellenistic age. They are inferior to the best compositions of the French poets; nothing was produced that could be compared remotely, for instance, with *Aucassin et Nicolette*. They have not the stamp of cosmopolitan literature. You may care for them or not, but they are not exotics nor second-hand imitations. Western Europe played a decisive part in creating the social conditions under which they appeared; but they are in all essential features, in spirit and matter, as well as in form, an outcome of indigenous development, the legitimate progeny of a literature which was always accustomed to take little and give much.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE
DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY
ON JUNE 6, 1914

BY
ALBERT C. CLARK
CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN

ERRATA

Page 10, l. 13, for published read practised
„ 23, l. 3 *from foot, for Siloam read Bethesda*
„ 26, l. 6 *from foot, for eleven read 10-11*

Clark Textual Criticism

June 1914

P 5027

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1914

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK
TORONTO MELBOURNE BOMBAY
HUMPHREY MILFORD M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TEXTUAL CRITICISM

THE first duty which I have to discharge on the present occasion is to refer, however shortly, to the great scholar who has passed away. Professor Ellis was so well known in Oxford that I can leave much unsaid. There is, however, one aspect of his character which may not be so familiar to many of my audience as it was to myself. I refer to his power of making friends and keeping them. I feel that I have some right to speak on this subject since I first made his acquaintance some thirty-five years ago, and our friendship was never dimmed by any cloud. Most of Robinson Ellis's friends had been at one time his pupils. It may at first seem strange that one who seemed to move in a world of his own, who was so absent-minded and so short-sighted, should have been able to secure the affection of undergraduates for so many generations. The secret of his power lay in the fact that he liked young men, and that they never felt shy with him. This was due to his simplicity, his want of reserve and his physical infirmities. He had a confiding way of taking a young friend by the arm, as if in need of support, while he complained of his lameness and weak sight, which made his companion conscious that he too had something to give.

Robinson Ellis had a large conception of scholarship which is more familiar now than it was when he was

young. Nowhere was the art of composition practised more successfully than in the English Universities, nowhere was the spirit of the Classics more appreciated. But from research as practised in Germany England held aloof. Robinson Ellis was himself a great stylist, but his sympathies were with the German method. To him research and progress were the vital issues, and it caused him pain to think that Oxford was lagging behind the age. It is of interest now to read a letter which he wrote to the University Commissioners in 1877. He there said :

‘I regard it as a matter of very great consequence that the University should be known on the Continent as contributing materially to enlarge the sphere of philology.’

The point on which he insisted most was the necessity of going to the MSS. He said :

‘During the last thirty years all or nearly all the principal contributions to an enlarged knowledge of Greek and Latin authors have been based on an investigation of MSS. of a minute and laborious kind unknown before. It has been my aim as a scholar to show that research in this department of Philology is not confined to the Continent, and that Englishmen are able to appreciate the treasures which lurk in their national collections.’

This was the central fact in his teaching, and it is his message to posterity. He was himself tireless in the quest for MSS., in spite of physical weakness and feeble sight. He made several notable discoveries, though with characteristic modesty he sometimes undervalued the new material which he had brought to light. It must be conceded that his collations were not always exact, but it is marvellous that he should have been able to do so much with his weak eyes. He had to struggle against a handicap which would have prevented

most men from engaging in serious study, and his perseverance was a proof of indomitable fortitude.

In the range of his learning he resembled the polymathic scholars of the sixteenth century. Nothing written in Latin was without interest to him, from Plautus down to Maximianus or Mico the Levite. He had a marvellous fund of erudition gathered from out of the way sources, e.g. Glossaries, of which he had made a special study. To him a Scholiast was almost sacred. Some members of the Philological Society may remember how once, when the statement of a Scholiast was impugned, he said with some emotion, 'Do I understand that Mr. X wishes to vilipend the Scholiast?'

There are two criticisms which have been brought against Robinson Ellis. The first concerns his choice of subjects. It is true that, after editing the great poet with whom his name is inseparably connected, he left the beaten track. He was like a great surgeon who confines himself to difficult operations. He was chiefly attracted by works which are exceedingly obscure, either on account of their subject-matter or of their corrupt text. He did much to enlarge the horizon of English scholarship. Thus, for instance, the interest now taken in Manilius is largely due to his influence. The second criticism concerns his tendency to subtlety, both in exegesis and in conjecture. This tendency cannot be denied, and it is not surprising that his fancy sometimes ran riot, in view of his solitary life and self-absorption. On the other hand he shows robust common sense when, in the Preface to his *Aetna*, he asserts the existence of the 'trained critical faculty', which he says is 'competent to reject the impossible in language, syntax or metre, however strongly it may be supported by early manuscript tradition and however

plausibly it may be shown to be quite explicable. There is a growing school of critics, not only in Germany but in England, the central point of whose creed is virtually to deny this.'

I will say no more. Posterity must decide his place in the hierarchy of scholarship. I venture to think that he will occupy a position beside his friend, H. A. J. Munro, as one of the great luminaries among English students of the Latin Poets in the nineteenth century.

I now turn to the subject of this lecture. I fear that it is somewhat technical in character, and possibly many of my hearers might have wished that I had selected some theme of more general interest. I can only plead in defence that it is difficult to say anything which is at all new upon a literary subject, while in the field of criticism there are some interesting developments.

The first duty of a critic is to be critical, and criticism tends to be subjective and sceptical. I wish to speak with all respect of the great scholars of the past, into the fruit of whose labours we have entered. Also, I do not wish for a moment to imply that their methods were unscientific. The greatest scholars at all periods have been keenly aware that the basis of textual criticism is to be found in palaeography. They were, however, somewhat prone to insist upon another element, viz. *δευόρης* on the part of the critic. Thus the great Bentley proclaimed *nobis et ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt*, and it has been said of him that he treated his MSS. in a masterful way much 'as if they had been Fellows of Trinity'. The methods of modern criticism are more humble and in a way more mechanical. The workman cannot exercise his work without tools, and with the growth of information more delicate instruments have been forged.

In the first place let us take the subject of palaeography. In former days it was not so easy to travel, and frequently libraries were reluctant to display their treasures. Thus so late as 1846, when Tregelles wished to consult the celebrated Vatican MS. of the New Testament (*B*), he was only allowed to look at it here and there, while two priests talked Latin to him all the time and snatched the volume out of his hands when he tried to take notes. Tischendorf in 1866 was only granted a few days in which to collate it, and was expelled from the library when it was found that he was copying continuous passages. I mention this, since no library is now administered with greater liberality than the Vatican. Also, photography has come to our aid. We now possess large collections of facsimiles, also complete reproductions of the most important MSS. The rotograph process makes it possible for the student to get at slight expense a copy which for practical purposes is as good as the original.

The methods of Latin palaeography have been revolutionized by Traube and his school. The chief object now is the study of national and local scripts and the tabulation of the compendia used in various centres. This is a matter of great moment, since the writer in one *scriptorium* was frequently unfamiliar with abbreviations used in another. The Irish script is of supreme importance, since so many classical authors have come down to us from copies made by the Irish monks who founded monasteries on the Continent, notably at St. Gallen and Bobbio. This is a subject which Professor Lindsay has made his own, and we already have from him a number of works dealing with the local varieties of the Insular script and the development of Irish compendia in Continental writing-schools. Also, the South

Italian, or Beneventan, hand is of capital importance for the tradition of various classical authors, e.g. Tac. *Annals*, xi-xvi, Apuleius, Varro, Hyginus, various works of Cicero, while the new fragment of Juvenal, discovered in the Bodleian Library by Mr. Winstedt, while an Oxford undergraduate, was preserved in a Beneventan MS. Here I may mention as a typical example of modern method the masterly work of Dr. Loew upon the Beneventan script recently published by the Clarendon Press.

Next to palaeography I would mention the progress of historical research, which enables us to trace the movements of MSS. throughout the Middle Ages, and to construct their biography. For this purpose the mediaeval catalogues are invaluable. I will take a single example. The catalogue of Cluni, written in 1158-61, mentions:¹

- 492. Libri epistolarum Ciceronis ad Atticum xvi.
- 496. Cicero pro Milone et pro Avito et pro Murena et pro quibusdam aliis.
- 498. Cicero in Catilinam et idem pro Q. Ligario et pro rege Deiotaro et de publicis litteris et de actione idemque in Verrem.

The last of these was recently discovered in the Holkham Library, first by L. Dorez and independently by Dr. Peterson. It is a ninth-century MS., and still bears the library mark *de conventu Clun.* The second is the old Cluni MS. taken to Italy by Poggio in the fifteenth century and now lost, from which all copies of the *Murena* and *pro Sex. Roscio* are derived. From internal evidence it can be shown to have been not later than the eighth century. A very important MS.

¹ Manitius, *Philologisches aus alten Bibliothekskatalogen*, p. 15.

of the Letters to Atticus, the Tornaesianus (Z), now lost, first came to light at Lyons, not far from Cluni. As MSS. of these Letters were very rare, and indeed this is the only mention of them in the old catalogues, No. 492 was doubtless the lost Tornaesianus. If so, the MS. deserved the description of 'very ancient' given to it by Lambinus. This is important, since critics who suspect its readings have argued that it was a fifteenth-century MS. grossly interpolated. The results of countless monographs have been collected by Manitius in his *Geschichte der lateinischen Litteratur des Mittelalters*, while a similar service has been performed for the period of the Renaissance by Voigt and Sabbadini. I cannot here refrain from mentioning a bold guess recently made by R. Beer, which may throw light on the largest collection of ancient Latin MSS. now extant. I refer to the Bobbio palimpsests, written before the time of St. Columban. He points out singular coincidences between these and the contents of the library formed by Cassiodorus, the minister of Theodoric, at his Vivarium. Thus a Bobbio MS. preserves a fragment of Gargilius Martialis *De re rustica*, a work mentioned by Cassiodorus, while another is our sole authority for the grammarian Claudius Sacerdos, whose treatise was used by him, also a Latin Euclid, a copy of which he possessed.¹ We have now a large quantity of information concerning the transmission of Latin texts, and gaps are being continually filled up. Such researches have disposed of much sceptical criticism. Take for example the absurd fable that the *Annals* of Tacitus were forged by Poggio. We now know that the eleventh-century MS., which contains the later books, was used by Boccaccio before Poggio was born,

¹ *Akad. Wissenschaft*, Wien, 1911, pp. 78-104.

while the ninth-century MS., which contains the earlier books, was brought to Italy from Corvei in 1508, forty-nine years after his death. Indeed, we possess a letter of Pope Leo X, written to the Archbishop of Maintz, in which he refers to the MS., which appears to have been stolen from the monks of Corvei by his agents, and sends in return a printed copy, 'nicely bound', together with a 'perpetual Indulgence', to compensate them for their loss.¹

The evidence yielded by such researches is not favourable to the hypothesis of extensive interpolation. There appear to have been few periods when anything like criticism was published. Apart from the Renaissance, when fertile and ingenious critics were at work, there is only one perilous zone, that of the Caroline Renaissance in the eighth and ninth centuries. For some two centuries before this period few classical MSS. were copied. The state of orthography in particular was deplorable, owing to the growth of the Romance languages and corruptions due to mispronunciation. The classics were saved from destruction by Alcuin of York, and corrected editions were issued by more or less competent scholars working at Tours, Fulda and elsewhere. Barbarous spellings and gross blunders vanish, as if by magic. The question, therefore, arises, to what extent the Caroline scribes tampered with the texts which they transcribed.

Professor Shipley has done important work by his study of two MSS. of Livy, one of which was actually copied from the other at this period. The model was the celebrated Puteaneus of the fifth century (*P*); the copy (*M*) was made by eight monks belonging to Tours, who signed their names to the quaternions which they

¹ *Philologus*, xlv, p. 378.

copied. Shipley well observes that in such a case 'it is possible to look over the shoulder of the mediaeval scribe as he sits at his task. One may follow his hand and eye as he copies letter by letter and word by word.' The general conclusion which he draws is that the errors are in the main due to mechanical causes, that 'the work shows almost no intentional alterations', and that the emendations are of the most superficial nature.

The mediaeval copyist was much in the position of the modern compositor who sets up something in a language of which he knows little or nothing. Sometimes he introduced the few words which he knew, e.g. *amen* for *tamen*, *Galilaea* for *Gallia*, *aeternus* for *externus*, but generally he copied with blind fidelity. The colophons attached to many MSS. throw light upon the writer's psychology. Sometimes he speaks of his labours, e.g.

'Tria digita scribunt
sed totum corpus laborat'.

Sometimes he refers to his want of skill, e.g.

'Sum scriptor talis, monstrat me littera qualis',
or wants his money, e.g.

'Finis adest operis, mercedem posco laboris',
or signifies his joy, e.g.

'Libro completo saltat scriptor pede laeto',
or says he would like something to drink, e.g.

'Finis adest libri: potum detur michi vini'.

Above the scribe there was the corrector, who stood in a similar relation to that occupied by the modern press reader. The average corrector does not show much sign of intelligence and confines himself to points of orthography, e.g. *maxim^us* or the substitution of *b* for *v*, e.g. *u^berua nec bellica^u*.¹ The chief duty which he

¹ So *V* for *verba nec bellica*, Cic. *Phil.* viii. 6.

performs is to insert passages omitted by the first hand, either from the model or from some other MS. Sometimes we find at work a more intelligent critic who annotates the MS. with signs meant to point out corruptions, e. g. q(uaere), r(equire), ζ(= ζήτει), and gives variants in the margin from other MSS.

The oldest MSS. are full of undisguised corruptions due to mechanical causes, such as the repetition or anticipation of passages from the context. The same cause accounts for many omissions. This, however, is a subject which I shall treat later on. Many MSS. bear on them visible evidence of the lineation found in the model. The most striking point, however, which I would here notice is, that we find everywhere conflate words which show that there were alternate readings in the model. I refer to such an example as *quods*, a conflation of *quod*^s. These are especially common in the fifth-century MSS. of Livy. I have also found a number in the fourth-century palimpsest of Cicero, *De re publica*. Such combinations as *cultums*, *assiduūmos*, *posset set*, *a rebrum* tell their own tale. Besides these minor variants we find others of greater importance, e. g. ^{corni}*liticinibus*, ^{sex}*et suffragiis*, ^a*ullae* . . . ^{it}*peruerterunt*, which must be traditional readings. I am convinced that a large number of ancient corruptions are due to misunderstanding caused by these doublets, and to the insertion of alternative readings in the wrong place. This is the sort of evidence which was removed by Caroline revisers, and it is chiefly here that we have to lament their activity.

I now go back to the papyri. These are mainly Greek, but the lesson which they teach is equally applicable to Latin. The subject was recently treated in a masterly lecture by Professor Hunt. The papyri

do not support the theory of the 'best MS.' on which most criticism has been based. What they show is that the readings of the inferior MSS. frequently have an equal claim to antiquity. Also, in the most ancient papyri we find double readings as in the Latin palimpsests. The general conclusion which he reaches is that on the whole the papyri confirm tradition. Although they establish a very large number of small corrections made by scholars, they lend no support to the theory of extensive adscripts and interpolations at a later date. Secondly, he considers that the chief corruptions belong to an early date before the rise of the Alexandrian critics. The chief evidence is in the case of Homer, but in other classical texts also he finds an increasing tendency to uniformity and stability, and considers the chief errors made afterwards due to mechanical causes, and especially to omission.

I pass lightly over this subject, since I am here concerned with Latin texts, not Greek. There are, however, several Latin papyri which have recently been discovered, among them being fragments of Cicero's speeches. The most important is a long piece of Cicero, *pro Caelio*, published in the last volume of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. This speech offers some interesting problems to the textual critic. The chief extant authority for it and a number of other speeches is a Paris MS. (*P*), written during the Caroline period. In this the first hand omits a large number of passages which were subsequently added by the second hand. Such great scholars as Madvig and Halm looked on these additions with grave suspicion. There are also other passages which are only given by fifteenth-century MSS. These they regarded as audacious interpolations. Thus Madvig, after rejecting from the text in § 24 one of these readings,

which gives a perfect sense, marks the lacuna with two stars and a dagger, remarking : ¹

‘Edendus est igitur necessario locus hoc tristi aspectu :
*Titus Caiusque * * † omni cum doctrina homo atque humanitatis.*’

Recently fresh evidence has come to light in the shape of a fifteenth-century collation, made from the Cluni MS. *no.* 496, before it was taken to Italy by Poggio, and now preserved in a Paris MS. (Σ).² This collation confirms the almost superhuman power of divination possessed by Madvig in the case of isolated passages, establishing on one page three consecutive conjectures made by him, one of which is an insertion of three words, but is entirely against him with regard to the suspected passages, all of which are vouched for by the Cluniacensis. The new papyrus as usual is eclectic and wavers between the two families, so far as minute differences are concerned. It is, however, consistent in its support of the doubtful passages, which are now brought back to the fifth century. It is, therefore, clear that their omission in *P* is due to accident. No better example could be found of the danger involved by following the ‘best MS.’ where it offers a shorter text.

The combined evidence seems to show that the *sciolus*, or the *mala manus*, that demon sometimes foolish, sometimes cunning, but always malignant, who was supposed to haunt the Dark Ages, was merely a phantom which has vanished in the daylight of further knowledge.

The discovery of papyri has been termed a divine judgement for sceptical critics. Their discomfiture has

¹ *Opuscula*, p. 393.

² *The vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio* (1905), p. 30.

been completed by a new weapon. I refer to the science of prose-rhythm.

The ancients tell us that prose, like verse, has its rhythm, and that this rhythm, while it pervades the sentence, is especially noticeable in the close (*clausula*) both of the sentence and of the clauses which compose the sentence. They tried to give rules and examples of particular rhythms, but met with little success. It is clear that they laboured under the same difficulties as we do now, when we try to analyse the rhythm of English. The secret, which was hidden to them, was revealed in the course of history, when the three chief rhythms became stereotyped in the shape of the mediaeval *cursus*.¹

Prose-rhythm was a system of musical punctuation. By this I mean that at the breaks in the sentence, where we place commas and colons, the ancient composer inserted a favourite cadence. This system can be illustrated from English, which, when it took over a number of Latin words, also inherited the Latin rhythms. The typical examples are *servants departed*, *perfect felicity*, *glorious undertaking*. There are minor forms which I need not notice. We need only construct an English sentence in which these cadences occur in lieu of stops, wherever the voice halts, and we shall realize the nature of rhythmical prose.

The theory applies to Greek as well as to Latin Prose, from the time of Isocrates onwards, but in Greek the problem is more complicated. The fullest results have been obtained in the case of Cicero, whose *clausulae* have been tabulated and classified. Zielinski has constructed a canon for Cicero, giving the exact percentages which we should expect to find in a genuine

¹ *The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin* (1910).

work. We are now in possession of Cicero's thumb-marks, and can decide with certainty whether a suspected work is authentic, or not.

Here again we have to notice the bankruptcy of subjective criticism. From the time of Markland (1745) it was fashionable to reject as spurious the speeches *post reditum*. The objections were mainly based on matters of language and style. The speeches were termed weak, periphrastic, and unworthy of Cicero. Also, their Latinity was impugned. It is now shown that the *numeri* conform exactly to the Ciceronian canon. The artist's hand is attested by his private mark. So too Orelli rejected as spurious the speeches against Catiline ii-iv, supposing that they had been forged by Tiro. He went on to suggest that a passage in Cicero's Letters, in which he mentions them (Att. ii. 1, 3), was inserted by Tiro, in order to cover his forgery. This view was supported by linguistic reasons, such as the use of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα. This slashing criticism is now out of date.

On the other hand the new test proves that the spurious Invective against Sallust, which was already current in the time of Quintilian, is not genuine: also the spurious *Consolatio*, which is generally supposed to have been written by Sigonius in the sixteenth century.

The conditions of textual criticism are now changed. Prose, as well as verse, has its metre, and the first duty of an editor is to learn the thumb-marks of his author. The results are both positive and negative: positive as serving to localize corruption, and negative when the suspected passage is protected by the rhythm. We have now an objective test, which can be applied to all conjectures affecting the clausula. I will take two instances. In Cicero, *Rosc. Am.* § 107 *iudices qui*

indicarit, Halm substitutes *quis* for *qui*, an alteration which looks very plausible. In Cat. iii. 22 *praesertim qui . . . superare potuerunt* Madvig reads *potuerint*, on the ground that the subjunctive is required after *praesertim qui*. The result in both cases is that one of Cicero's favourite rhythms is replaced by one of which there is no example in Cicero's speeches. Since these contain some 17,902 clausulae, the odds are 17,902 to 1 against the proposed emendation. The chief result, however, has been to vindicate a very large number of passages which have been bracketed by editors as mere repetitions. It is quite true that they add little to the sense, but they have metrical value. There is an analogy between prose and lyric poetry, as was pointed out by various ancient writers, and frequently a passage which seems to be otiose is the antistrophe which is demanded by the strophe.

It must further be remembered that the question of rhythm is not confined to the clausula. We are told by Cicero that it pervades the sentence: *numerus est in omni parte verborum* (*Orator*, § 203). The most interesting observation so far made is that Cicero throughout the sentence avoids a dactylic rhythm. Zielinski illustrates by the use of *minari* and *minitari*. Cicero does not say *mūltā minārī* or *mūltūm minītārī*. The regular use is *mūltūm minārī*, but *mūltā minītārī*.¹

It would be beyond the scope of this lecture to point out the endless possibilities of research presented by the study of prose-rhythm. In Greek the rhythm of Plato has never been studied. The genuineness of speeches attributed to Demosthenes can be decided when the canon of Demosthenic rhythm has been constructed. In Latin we require a treatise upon Cicero's

¹ *Philologus*, 1906, p. 614.

use of synonyms, the collocation of words in the sentence, and the use of grammatical irregularities for rhythmical effect. The rhythm of Latin historians, notably that of Livy and Tacitus, who set at defiance the Ciceronian rules, calls aloud for investigation. The later writers, whose prose was strictly metrical, must be re-edited, since previous editors have introduced all manner of metrical solecisms. A beginning has already been made by Ziegler in his edition of Firmicus Maternus and C. U. Clark in his edition of Ammianus Marcellinus. The German Universities are pouring out programmes upon the rhythm of different authors. Recently I read a dissertation, covering 102 pages written in Latin, by an American lady, Miss Susan Helen Ballou, for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of Giessen, on the clausulae of Flavius Vopiscus. I hardly think Flavius Vopiscus worthy of such attention, but what wonderful enthusiasm! Meanwhile Oxford remains apathetic, and prizes are given for compositions which in structure are barbarous. I fear that there will be no cure until, as we say here, the subject 'comes into Mods.'

I now turn to a subject in which I am much interested, viz. that of omissions in MSS. When we are comparing two allied MSS. the first point to ascertain is, whether one of them omits a passage which is contained in a line, or several lines, of the other, since, if so, we have proof that it is a copy made from the other MS. My own interest in textual criticism dates from a small discovery of this kind, which I made some twenty-five years ago. I was examining a British Museum MS. (Harl. 2682) which, among other things, contains certain extracts from the Verrines, also found in a German MS. generally known as *E* (Berol. 252).

Here a passage omitted by *E* occupies exactly one line in *H*, viz.:

les ille cum ego hennam uenissem presto mihi sacerdotes Cereris cum infulis ac uerbis fuerunt contio.

This is proof positive that *E* was copied from the Harleian (*H*). Shortly afterwards *H* has a passage written thus:

libentissime dedit. Mittit etiam trullam gemmeam rogatum, uelle se eam diligentius considerare, ea quoque ei mittitur. Nunc . . .

Here *E* omits *mittit* . . . *mittitur*. The eye of the copyist travelled from *dedit* in the line above to *nunc* in the line below.

I have since found this test of great value when I have been trying to unravel the tangled pedigree of various fifteenth-century MSS. Thus a Florentine MS. known as Lag. 24 is shown to be derived in the speeches against Rullus from another MS. in the same library known as Lag. 39, since it omits a passage which occupies one line in Lag. 39, viz.:

Rull. ii. 86 altera Roma quaeretur. In id oppidum homines nefarii rem publicam uestram.

In another speech, in *Pisonem*, § 1, it is shown to have been copied from another MS., Lag. 13. Here the first hand omits a passage which occupies a line in Lag. 13, viz.:

mentis est hic in fraudem homines impulit, hic eos quibus est ignotus.

So also a British Museum MS. of the Verrines, Harl. 4582, is proved to be derived from another Florentine MS., Lag. 29, since in v. 168 it omits the words:

crucem tolleretur. Sed quid ego de Gaio? quasi tu Gaio tum fueris

which form one line in Lag. 29.

Sometimes such omissions are frequent. Thus a Wolfenbüttel MS. of Cicero's speeches (*W*), copied from a Paris MS. (*Σ*), on no less than sixteen occasions omits a line of *Σ*.

We are not often able to compare the original with the copy, but have the copy only. In this case also we can sometimes be sure that the scribe has omitted a line. This is when a word has been mutilated or chopped in two by the omission. I would illustrate by a passage which appeared in the *Globe* of May 1, viz.:

That speculators who dabble in oil shares, and particularly in those of companies possessing individual propositions as distinct from the shares of trust companies, undertake consider-
had further advanced to 970. The directors ex-
of this has just been provided by the Egyptian group.

A few lines further on we find:

A telegram received from Gemsah stated that the specific gravity of the oil yielded by Well 13 had further advanced to 970. The directors explained.

Here it is obvious that a line has dropped out after *consider*-. The loss was repaired in a later edition, in which is inserted

*able risks is well known. A striking example*¹

Such mutilated passages are found in most MSS., but are not common. There are, however, a large number of cases where there is no such clue, since the passage is self-contained and not indispensable to the context.

¹ The line which has replaced this is a corrected version ('970 for 970) of one which occurs further on. The substitution is due to the confusion caused by *explained* and *example*.

How then shall we judge if it is true or false, whether it has been omitted by one MS. or interpolated in the other by our old enemy, the *sciolus*? The method generally adopted may be summed up thus: 'Follow the best MS., follow it through thick and thin. If it has a passage not found in other MSS., the passage is genuine. If not, it is the work of a *sciolus*.' This is reinforced by the adage *Brevior lectio potior*.

Let us pause for a moment to consider the causes of omission. One obvious cause is negligence, another is hurry, and a third is ignorance. When a man is writing something which he does not fully understand, he is more likely to omit than if he is following the argument. But in a copyist there is no more blessed quality than ignorance, and it is a commonplace, rather than a paradox, to say that the best MSS. are those written by the most ignorant scribes. Thus the best MS. for Cicero's speeches is the Vaticanus (*V*), which contains the Philippics and certain other speeches. Yet I know of no MS. written by a more ignorant person, or more full of gross and obvious corruptions, which merely testify to its good faith. I cannot understand why critics should be reluctant to admit that their favourite MS. omits passages. The tendency to do so does not affect its good faith, which is really the important virtue in a MS.

It was precisely this MS. *V* which started me upon a line of inquiry which has proved fruitful. I noticed that certain passages omitted by it, and found in the other family of MSS., contained the same number of letters. The suspicion occurred that this number of letters might represent a line in the archetype. I then found that longer passages contained multiples of this unit. The particular unit was 28, and the multiples; e. g.

56, 84, 112, 140. I also found this unit present in passages which had been transposed, also that corruptions due to double readings had a way of getting into the text at intervals corresponding to multiples of the unit. I also found that the same unit was present in the omissions, transpositions and corruptions of the other family (*D*). I could, therefore, no longer doubt that I was on the track of the archetype.

Here I must stop for a moment to inquire the cause of this uniformity. The most ancient MSS. were written in capitals, without any division between the words and with hardly any abbreviations. A simple inspection is enough to show that, as a matter of fact, the lines contain on the average about the same number of letters. I would illustrate from a papyrus (Hibeh 26) written in the third century B.C. Here the figures for twenty lines are 26, 26, 26, 27, 28, 29, 26, 24, 28, 24, 27, 25, 25, 26, 26, 26, 25, 28, 27, 23 = 522. Average 26.

Further, it is usual for a MS. to contain the same number of lines in every page. The consequence is that similar agreements are to be found in the contents of longer divisions, viz. columns, pages and folios. Here I would illustrate from the Ambrosian palimpsest of Cicero (cent. iv). This is written in three columns with 24 lines to the page. The columns are very narrow, containing an average of 11-12 letters. I took the trouble to count the letters in ten pages of this MS., and found some remarkable agreements. Thus pp. 16 and 31 in Peyron's transcript both contain 833 letters: p. 26 has 836: p. 25, 840: pp. 17 and 21, 843. The total for ten pages is 8,446, which gives an average of 844 to a page. The average number of letters in the first column throughout the ten pages is 283, and that for the third column is 282.

I have treated in this way a large number of papyri, palimpsests and MSS. of great antiquity, and find everywhere more or less strongly marked this tendency to uniformity of content. Some of the largest figures are the most remarkable. Thus *V* has a considerable dislocation in the later Philippics due to loose folios in the archetype. Two passages have been transposed, the first of which, according to my reckoning, contains 5,828 and the second 5,826 letters.

These figures will suffice to show that we now have an objective test, founded on arithmetic, which we may apply to suspected passages. If they exhibit the working of a common unit, they cannot be the work of an interpolator, but must represent a genuine tradition.

My work has been chiefly done upon Cicero, and I hope before long to publish the results. Meanwhile the method may be judged from a little book which I recently published on the Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts.¹ I must remark that I entered upon the inquiry with a general prepossession in favour of Westcott and Hort's Text, and the Revised Text which is based on it. My only object at first was to see whether the two oldest Greek MSS., the Vaticanus (*B*) and the Sinaiticus (*ℵ*), contained any evidence which threw light upon their archetype.

I must here mention that there are three texts of the Gospels and Acts, the most obvious difference between them being their length. The shortest text is found in the two oldest Greek MSS., *B* and *ℵ*, which do not contain e. g. the end of St. Mark, St. John vii. 53-viii. 2, the moving of the waters in the pool of Siloam (John v. 4), the Agony in the Garden, the words of forgiveness from the Cross, and a very large number of other

¹ Oxford, 1914.

passages, including clauses in the Lord's Prayer (Luke xi. 2 and 4). A longer text is found in nearly all other Greek MSS., including some of great antiquity. This stereotyped text is that rendered in our Authorized Version. There is, however, a still longer text, which is generally termed 'Western'. The name is a bad one, since it is found in the East as much as in the West. We have for this only one old Greek, or rather Graeco-Latin MS., the Codex Bezae (*D*), cent. v/vi. It is, however, supported by nearly all the ancient versions, notably the old Latin and the old Syriac, which are said to go back to about 150 A.D. Also, this is the text which is quoted by the oldest Fathers, such as Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Clement of Alexandria. This text contains the passages which are not found in *B* and *N*, also others which have not made their way into the *textus receptus*.

Most biblical critics, including Burgon as well as Hort, are agreed that the 'Western' text was that generally current in the second century A.D. They say, however, that at a very early period the text of the Gospels became incredibly corrupt. Hort's view is that a purer text was preserved somewhere, from which *B* and *N* are descended. More recently some critics have realized that the 'Western' text cannot be disposed of in this way, but while they defend special readings, especially in the Acts, most of them regard the larger additions as a 'congeries of interpolations'.

I must here remark that in the case of New Testament criticism the theory of interpolation reigns supreme. It is always assumed that the writers added, or omitted, passages to suit their own views. The hypothesis of accident has been ignored. Also the rule *brevior lectio potior* has never been pushed to further lengths than

by Hort in the New Testament. Thus, while he rejects all additions to the text found in the 'Western' family, he treats their evidence as sufficient if they omit anything found in other MSS. Thus he rejects St. Luke xxii. 19-20,

'Which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you',

on the ground that the passage is omitted by *D* and \mathfrak{U}^a . He did not notice that there are curious dislocations and omissions here in several members of the 'Western' family, which testify to some confusion in a common ancestor. The particular passage in question contains in the Greek 152 letters, and the Syriac Peshitta immediately above (vv. 17-18 *καὶ δεξιόμενος . . . ἔλθῃ*) omits 152 letters. Are we to call this a mere coincidence?

The examination which I made shows clearly that the text of the Gospels was transmitted in very narrow columns with an average of 10-12 letters to the line. There are examples of this formation among the theological papyri, and it is common in old Latin palimpsests. In the case of short passages the numerical test is not conclusive, since the unit is so small. Proof can only be given by the longest passages. If we find in them the presence of a larger unit, which seems to correspond to some division, i.e. a column or a page in a common ancestor, they can hardly be a congeries of interpolations.

I made a list of all the passages the genuineness of which has been doubted, arranging them in order of length. Most of them are found in the 'Western' family and some in *D* alone.

The five longest are :

(166) Luke v. 14 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον· ὥστε μηκέτι δύνασθαι αὐτὸν φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἔξω ἦν ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις· καὶ συνήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ ἦλθεν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.¹

(167) John v. 4 ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν· ἄγγελος γὰρ κυ̅ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑγιὴς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι.

(320) Matt. xx. 28 ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι· εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεσθε εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μή ποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι, Ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἡττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἡττων, καὶ ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ, Σύναγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον

(829) John vii. 53-viii. 11 καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν . . . μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε

(964) Mark xvi. 9-20 ἀναστὰς δὲ . . . ἀμήν.

Here it is to be noticed that two passages, 166 and 167, are practically of the same length, while $166 \times 5 = 830$. Also $320 \times 3 = 960$. There are other singular coincidences which I cannot here mention. The only conclusion which seems compatible with these figures is, that the passages defend each other, and that the theory of interpolation is less likely than that of accidental omission. I look upon the numbers 160-167 as representing a page or a column in an archetype, which appears to have contained sixteen lines with an average of eleven letters to the line.

If this is so, the question of the shorter passages assumes a different position. I would illustrate from two examples only.

Luke xxiv. 42. 'And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb.'

¹ This passage is peculiar to *D*.

Here the words *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου* are poorly attested, being omitted by *D* as well as *B* **N**. On the other hand, who would have invented such a detail? W.H. remark: 'a singular interpolation, evidently from an extraneous source, whether written or oral'.

Here it is important to notice that the words contain twenty-one letters, which would occupy two lines in the archetype.

Luke xxiii. 34. 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' The Greek (*ὁ δὲ Ἰς ἔλεγε, πρ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσι*) contains forty-two letters.

Four verses further on comes another suspected passage, 'In letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew'. Here again the Greek contains forty-three letters.

The text of the New Testament presents analogies to that of Homer. Professor Hunt finds in the oldest papyri a fluid text, which after the revision of Aristarchus became fixed and uniform. The first revision of the Gospels seems to have taken place in Alexandria, and there is good reason for attributing it to the circle of Origen, or possibly to Origen. He is known to have adopted in his edition of the Old Testament the methods of Aristarchus, and is accused by Jerome of corrupting the text by his obels and asterisks. We may, therefore, regard him, or some friend of his, as the Aristarchus of the Gospels. The method followed by the reviser responsible for the *B* **N** text was *brevior lectio potior*, and he struck out passages omitted by MSS. which he thought accurate, without asking if the omission might not be due to accident. Subsequent revisers, who constructed the *textus receptus*, reversed his proceedings and restored a number of the banished passages.

The primitive text of Homer is to be found in the quotations of Aeschines, Plato, and other ancient writers,

The five longest are :

(166) Luke v. 14 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον· ὥστε μηκέτι δύνασθαι αὐτὸν φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἔξω ἦν ἐν ἐρήμοις τόποις· καὶ συνήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ ἦλθεν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.¹

(167) John v. 4 ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν· ἄγγελος γὰρ κῦ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑγιὴς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι.

(320) Matt. xx. 28 ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξήσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι· εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεσθε εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μή ποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι, "Ἐτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, καὶ ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ, Σύνναγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον

(829) John vii. 53-viii. 11 καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν . . . μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε

(964) Mark xvi. 9-20 ἀναστὰς δὲ . . . ἀμήν.

Here it is to be noticed that two passages, 166 and 167, are practically of the same length, while $166 \times 5 = 830$. Also $320 \times 3 = 960$. There are other singular coincidences which I cannot here mention. The only conclusion which seems compatible with these figures is, that the passages defend each other, and that the theory of interpolation is less likely than that of accidental omission. I look upon the numbers 160-167 as representing a page or a column in an archetype, which appears to have contained sixteen lines with an average of eleven letters to the line.

If this is so, the question of the shorter passages assumes a different position. I would illustrate from two examples only.

Luke xxiv. 42. 'And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb.'

¹ This passage is peculiar to *D*.

Here the words *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου* are poorly attested, being omitted by *D* as well as *B* **N**. On the other hand, who would have invented such a detail? W.H. remark: 'a singular interpolation, evidently from an extraneous source, whether written or oral'.

Here it is important to notice that the words contain twenty-one letters, which would occupy two lines in the archetype.

Luke xxiii. 34. 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' The Greek (*ὁ δὲ Ἰς ἔλεγε, πρ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσι*) contains forty-two letters.

Four verses further on comes another suspected passage, 'In letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew'. Here again the Greek contains forty-three letters.

The text of the New Testament presents analogies to that of Homer. Professor Hunt finds in the oldest papyri a fluid text, which after the revision of Aristarchus became fixed and uniform. The first revision of the Gospels seems to have taken place in Alexandria, and there is good reason for attributing it to the circle of Origen, or possibly to Origen. He is known to have adopted in his edition of the Old Testament the methods of Aristarchus, and is accused by Jerome of corrupting the text by his obels and asterisks. We may, therefore, regard him, or some friend of his, as the Aristarchus of the Gospels. The method followed by the reviser responsible for the *B* **N** text was *brevior lectio potior*, and he struck out passages omitted by MSS. which he thought accurate, without asking if the omission might not be due to accident. Subsequent revisers, who constructed the *textus receptus*, reversed his proceedings and restored a number of the banished passages.

The primitive text of Homer is to be found in the quotations of Aeschines, Plato, and other ancient writers,

also in the papyri of the third century B.C.: that of the Gospels in the quotations of the Early Fathers, the oldest versions, and in the Codex Bezae.

I fear that I have strayed from the realm of Latin literature with which I should deal on this occasion. I would only say that the method which I have used was developed in the course of a minute and protracted study of Ciceronian MSS., and that I hope shortly to publish my results. If I had given examples from Cicero, you might have thought that it was hardly worth while to add fresh words to one who was already somewhat prolix and redundant. The method can be applied to all ancient prose works, so I give illustrations from that text which has been most fiercely contested.

FRESH LIGHT
ON
ROMAN BUREAUCRACY

An Inaugural Lecture

*Delivered before the University of Oxford
on March 11, 1920*

By

H. STUART JONES, M.A.

*Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University
of Oxford*

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1920

NOTE.—The papyrus which forms the subject of this lecture is now included in Paul M. Meyer's collection of *Juristische Papyri* (Berlin 1920), No. 93; and its bearing on some questions of Roman Law is discussed by O. LENEL and J. PARTSCH in *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1920, No. 1

FRESH LIGHT ON ROMAN BUREAUCRACY

IN two years' time the foundation of Sir William Camden will celebrate its tercentenary. It has had a long, but not in all periods a distinguished, history. Amongst the earlier occupants of the chair there are few whose names are now remembered, and those few won their fame in other fields than that of Ancient History. In the eighteenth century the chair was held in succession by a Lord Chancellor and a Poet Laureate, but no one would now connect the names either of Lord Stowell or of Thomas Warton with the study of classical antiquity. Later still, we find Elmsley in the Camden chair, but he will always be remembered for the scholarship displayed in his editions of Euripides. George Rawlinson, the last Professor under the old statute, was also the first to rest his title to fame solely upon historical research.

With the coming into effect of the reformed statute there ensued important changes. In the first place, a home was found for the Camden chair within the walls of this most hospitable of foundations. Secondly, there was found that special tie between the chair and the study of Roman history which has been provisionally confirmed by a Decree of the University and is not likely to be easily broken. What is of still greater importance, the two holders of the chair since 1889 set a standard of distinction as historians and teachers to which it will be difficult indeed for their successors to

attain. With both of them it was my privilege to form ties of friendship, the memory of which I shall always treasure. HENRY PELHAM, Scholar, and afterwards President, of the Foundation of which I was for many years a member, belonged by birth to that circle of great families from which England has drawn, century after century, a succession of fit persons duly qualified to serve God in Church or State. From his ancestry he drew that political tradition and intuitive grasp of the principles of government which gave him a sure understanding of the growth and working of the institutions of the ruling race of the ancient world; no one could have been better fitted to build on the foundations so well and truly laid by Mommsen, interpreting the results of the German historian's researches with a balance, a judgement, and a practical insight which Mommsen, condemned by the political conditions of his time to a fruitless and often bitter opposition, could hardly be expected to display. It was an unkind fate which first visited him with partial failure of eyesight and then cut short his days. But fate was even less kind to his successor. FRANCIS HAVERFIELD, with a grasp of essentials and realities as firm as that of Pelham, looked at the ancient, and especially the Roman, world from a somewhat different angle. He was less interested in the arts of government—though in these, too, he was well versed—than in the life of the governed. How men lived under the Roman dominion, and especially how they lived in our own island, albeit, as he himself called it, 'an unimportant province in a vast and complex Empire'—this it was his passionate desire to know. But he was well aware that only by infinite patience and by the minute examination of sites and the remains they have yielded up can such questions be answered;

and he was still collecting the material for a new 'Britannia', which would have given us an adequate measure of the progress of knowledge since Camden's day, when his thread of life was untimely snapped. One can render him no higher tribute than to say that no single scholar can complete that task as he would have completed it; it must, and doubtless will be carried to its conclusion by a band of organized workers. Thanks to his teaching and inspiration we have in Oxford sound and vigorous traditions, and although the war took a terrible toll of our younger historians—space forbids me to do more than mention LEONARD CHEESMAN and GUY DICKINS, with whose names I would gladly couple that of one who did not die by the hand of the enemy, HENRY JULIAN CUNNINGHAM—I doubt not that those whom I hope I may call my fellow workers will maintain those traditions, and, I should like to add, will not merely contribute to the advancement of learning, but will also help to restore—as scholars can and should—the broken comity of nations.

I have chosen for the subject of this lecture an ancient document, discovered some years since, but only recently published, the study of which will, I think, convince the most sceptical that there is still progress to be made in the field of Ancient History, which some perhaps believe to have been wellnigh exhausted by intensive cultivation. If I were asked to give a title to this document, I could only describe it in Greek as *ὁ γνώμων τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου*. There may be those among my hearers to whom this phrase conveys no very precise meaning. If any such person were to seek enlightenment in the lexicon of Liddell and Scott, he would find amongst the meanings of the word *γνώμων* a metaphorical use (like that of the Latin *norma*) in the sense of 'a rule of life'. It

does indeed bear this sense in the *Hermotimus* of Lucian (§ 76), but that passage is not cited in the lexicon. Here we find the usage illustrated by a not very apt quotation from Theognis (l. 543), where the poet speaks of judging a suit *παρὰ στάθμην καὶ γνώμονα*—‘by line and square’—and further supported by the phrase *τὸν γνώμονα τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου προσέχειν*, cited from the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* 4957. 44. There, if we assume the restoration in the *Corpus* to be correct, the words *παρακελεύσομαι τὸν γνώμονα τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου προσέχειν* could have but one meaning, viz. ‘I will issue instructions to the Controller of the Privy Purse to attend to the matter.’ For the document in question is none other than the famous Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander, Viceroy of Egypt in the year of the Four Emperors, of whom I shall presently have more to say, and the meaning which I have assigned to the phrase under consideration is that which was given to it by all scholars down to and including Dittenberger, who published a revised text of the Edict in the *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones*, No. 669. It was pointed out in the *C. I. G.* that the sense of *ἴδιος λόγος* was made clear by a passage of Strabo (xvii. 1. 12), who enumerates amongst the financial officers of the imperial administration in Egypt *ὁ προσαγορευόμενος ἴδιος λόγος, ὃς τῶν ἀδεσπότην καὶ τῶν εἰς Καίσαρα πίπτειν ὀφειλοντων ἐξεταστής ἐστιν*, i. e. an official charged with enforcing the claims of the *fiscus* on what in Roman law were called *bona vacantia et caduca*, i. e. escheats, lapses, and forfeitures. It was natural to assume that, as Egypt was treated as an appanage of the imperial crown rather than a province of the Roman people, the *ἴδιος λόγος* was equivalent to the ‘privy purse’ of the Emperors, *ratio privata*, as it would be expressed in Latin; and that *γνώμων* in the Edict of

Alexander was the title of its controller. It can now be shown that the second of these propositions is untenable and the first improbable. In the first place, although *γνώμων* is used of persons in the sense of an official inspector, as at Athens¹ and probably also at Iasos,² it also bears the meaning 'tariff', rightly assigned to it by Liddell and Scott on the authority of an ancient lexicon,³ and is not uncommon in this sense in inscriptions and papyri. For example, the tariff of desert-tolls discovered by Mr. Flinders Petrie at Koptos⁴ is called a *γνώμων*, and, what is more pertinent to the question before us, in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus of A.D. 13,⁵ certain dead timber is claimed by the *ἴδιος λόγος* 'under the terms of the tariff' (*κατὰ τὸν γνώμονα*), and Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, in their note on the passage, implied that this was the meaning of the word in the Edict of Alexander. We shall soon see that this has now been placed beyond doubt, and that Dittenberger's restoration of the inscription must be revised.

Furthermore, the discoveries of the sixty years which followed the publication of the third volume of the *C. I. G.* brought many facts to light with regard to the *ἴδιος λόγος*. We learnt, for example, from an inscription which, though included in the *Corpus*, was then but imperfectly deciphered, that an official bearing the title *ὁ πρὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ* and holding the high titular rank of *συγγενὴς τοῦ βασιλέως* at the court of Alexandria, held office in the time of Ptolemy Auletes (57 B.C.); and papyri of the second century B.C. threw some light upon the nature of his functions. The most instructive of these is *P. Amh.* 31,⁶ from which we learn that in

¹ Lys. vii. 25 : but the reading is doubtful.

² *S. I. G.* 96. 52.

³ *A. B.* 223.

⁴ *O. G. I.* 674.

⁵ *P. Oxy.* 1188.

⁶ Wilcken, *Chrest.* 161.

112 B.C. a revenue official named Hermias, being on tour in the Pathyrite nome, received information that an Egyptian lady named Senpoëris had enclosed a plot of waste land without permission and planted it with date-palms. The lady was called to account, and a few strokes of the *kurbash*—delicately termed in official language *πειθανάγκη*—sufficed to induce her to admit the impeachment and to agree to the payment of 1200 dr. in copper, which, according to Ptolemaic practice, were treated at once as a penalty imposed for unauthorized plantation and as a price paid for crown property. The sum was paid into the royal bank at Hermonthis *εἰς τὸν ἴδιον λόγον τῶν βασιλέων*, which *prima facie* appears to mean the private account of the Crown.

Documents of the Roman period relating to the *ἴδιος λόγος* were not uncommon, but they presented some puzzling features. They confirmed the statement of Strabo that *ἴδιος λόγος* was used as the title of the administrator, besides its proper signification of the fund administered; they showed that he was an imperial *procurator* or, in Greek, *ἐπίτροπος*, and, when a fixed scale of salaries was introduced, a *procurator dutenarius* receiving 200,000 HS. per annum. We learnt from the Cattaoui papyrus,¹ which contains a collection of legal decisions in the matter of the marriage and inheritances of soldiers, that the *ἴδιος λόγος* exercised a jurisdiction independent of that of the *praefectus Aegypti* in certain cases. We found him, of course, concerned with *ἀδέσποτα*, and by stretching the use of this term we could explain how in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus above referred to two dry branches of a persea-tree growing on the tomb of the sacred animals in the village of Kerkeura, reported to be of the value of two drachmas,

¹ Mitteis, *Chrest.* 372.

should be claimed on his behalf. It was less easy to see why, in A.D. 194, application should be made to the *ἴδιος λόγος* by a Graeco-Egyptian named Eudaemon, son of Psois and Tiathreus, for permission to change his name to Eudaemon, son of Hero and Didyme, which application was granted 'without prejudice to any public or private claims'.¹ It was equally difficult to explain the connexion of the *ἴδιος λόγος* with ecclesiastical matters. A papyrus of the year A.D. 159-60 mentions an information laid before the *ἴδιος λόγος* against a priest of the god Soknopaios on the ground that he had allowed his hair to grow and worn a woollen garment. From the reign of Severus Alexander we have a packet of monthly nil-returns rendered by local officials in the name of Heracleopolis, whose duty it was to report any neglect of duty by the clergy of the village 'to the department of the *ιδιόλογοι* and high priest'. It was largely upon the evidence of these documents that scholars based the theory that the *ἴδιος λόγος* was in fact identical with the 'High-Priest of Alexandria and Egypt' who in Roman times was the supervisor of the Egyptian State-Church and occupied a position similar to that of the Procurator of the Holy Synod in Russia under the Tsars. This conjecture, though it has been and still is generally accepted, is, as we shall presently see, very far from possessing the certainty which has been claimed for it.

Such was the state of our knowledge with regard to the *ἴδιος λόγος* up to the outbreak of the Great War. That the controller of the privy purse (as he was termed) was at the head of a department with which the population of Egypt of all classes was brought into constant

¹ Wilcken, *Chrest.* 52.

² *B. G. U.* 16; Wilcken, *Chrest.* 114.

contact, generally to its cost, was hardly suspected. His main concern, it was thought, was with the administration of the imperial estates, or *οὐσίαι*, once the possessions of members of the reigning house, such as Livia or Antonia, Germanicus, the two Agrippinas, and Messalina, or of favourites and freedmen like Seneca and Narcissus, but gradually absorbed by an inexorable process into the vast imperial patrimony; but, as we shall see, it is by no means clear that the management of these properties belonged to his functions.

Towards the close of 1913 a brief note in the monthly reports appended to the *Jahrbuch der preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, a periodical mainly concerned with the art treasures acquired by the Berlin Museum, conveyed to the few who read it the information that a recently discovered papyrus probably found at Theadelphia in the Fayum, and presented by William II to the Museum, would, when published, be found to throw much fresh light on the Roman administration of Egypt, and incidentally on questions of Roman private law. With the outbreak of war the curtain fell; and it was not until 1919 that this remarkable document was published, with a brief introduction and a literal translation, as the first part of vol. v of the *Berliner griechische Urkunden*. The legal and historical commentary which it so sorely needs will no doubt in the fullness of time be supplied by Seckel and Schubart, but under present conditions we may have to exercise some patience in awaiting it. Fortunately it was minutely studied by Gerhard Plaumann, a scholar of great promise and amazing industry, whose death on the western front within three weeks of the signing of the armistice was a grievous loss to historical science; and his monograph on the *ἱδίας λόγος*, published in the transactions of the

Berlin Academy for 1918, as well as his article under the same title in the Encyclopaedia of Pauly-Wissowa, go some way, albeit but a very little way, towards supplying the want of a commentary.

The document which interests us was written on the back of an account drawn up by the *σιτολόγοι* of Bernicis, a small village in the neighbourhood of Theadelphia, in the year A.D. 149. The Emperor Antoninus Pius is mentioned in it as living, and the careful script employed by the writer (who was not using his natural cursive hand) points to the middle of the second century A.D. The copy was probably made by the *κωμογραμματεὺς* or village clerk of Theadelphia, certainly in and for the use of his office.

Fortunately the opening words leave us in no doubt with regard to the nature and contents of the document. They read as follows :

το[ῦ γ]νώμον[ος], ὃν ὁ θεὸς Σεβαστὸς τῇ τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου ἐπιτροπῇ [παρ]εστήσατο, καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ χεῖρα αὐτῷ π[ρ]οσγεγονότ[ω]ν ἤτοι ὑπὸ αὐτοκρατόρων ἢ συνκλή[το]ν ἢ τῶν [κατ]ὰ καιρὸν ἐπάρχων ἢ ἰδίων λόγων τὰ ἐν μέ[σ]φ [κειρ]ά-
λαια συντεμῶν ὑπέταξ[ά] σοι, ὅπως τῇ τ[ῆς] ἀναγραφῆς ὀλιγομερία τὴν μνήμην ἐπιστή[σας] εὐχερ[ῶς] τῶν πραγ-
μάτων περι[κ]ρατῆς.

and may be translated thus :

‘I have made an abridgement of the middle chapters of the code of regulations drawn up by the divine Augustus for the department of the *ἴδιος λόγος*, and the additions made to it from time to time by Emperors or by the Senate or by the Praefects for the time being or by the *ἱδιοὶ λόγοι* and set it before you in order that you may find in this brief compendium an aid to memory and be enabled easily to deal with the cases which come before you.’

The γνώμων τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου, then, was something more than a tariff: it was a code of regulations drawn up by order of Augustus for the guidance of the department. We do not, of course, possess it in anything like a complete form in our papyrus; apart from the fact that the document is mutilated towards the close, the writer expressly tells us that it is an abridgement, and an abridgement of a part only of the Code. It is, however, fairly clear that the chapters preserved to us are those which possess the greatest interest for the historian. We may recall that the *locus classicus* of Strabo described the ἴδιος λόγος as τῶν ἀδεσπότην καὶ τῶν εἰς Καίσαρα πίπτειν ὀφειλόντων ἐξεταστής, that is to say, it was his duty to claim for the *fiscus bona vacantia* and *caduca*, which we may here take in a wide sense to include not only such 'lapses' as passed to the *fiscus* but all forfeited and confiscated property. Now the Gnomon (as I shall hereinafter call our papyrus) has no section dealing with ἀδέσποτα, and I think it may fairly be assumed that the opening chapters of the Code of Augustus were concerned with these matters. Naturally enough, the *κομογραμματεὺς* might be assumed to be more familiar with the customary practice in the matter of ἀδέσποτα, including, as we saw, dead timber and the like, which concerned the everyday life of the village, than with the complicated questions of status and inheritance, which might baffle even a trained lawyer.

The papyrus is divided into paragraphs which are numbered consecutively up to eighty, but no farther, although there is no change of subject at that point. One hundred and fifteen of these are, on the whole, well preserved, and a few letters belonging to six others can be read. The first thirty-six paragraphs deal with lapsed or forfeited property; and in order to determine

when such lapse or forfeiture takes place, the Gnomon recapitulates, in no very logical order, a select number of the rules of inheritance, sometimes of the *ius civile*, but much more frequently of the *ius gentium*, and the special applications of these in Graeco-Egyptian law. The student of Roman law and of the local law of the Hellenized East (*Reichsrecht* and *Volksrecht*, to use the phrase of Mitteis) will find much to ponder over both in this section and in that which follows (paragraphs 37-54), where the status of persons is in question. We then have six paragraphs (nos. 58-63) on the registration of property, six on the passport system (nos. 64-9), and one which forbids officials to bid for Government property. Then follows a long section (paragraphs 71-97) on ecclesiastical matters, which is of great importance for the history of the relations between the Empire and the Egyptian Church; the remainder of the document contains a collection of miscellaneous regulations, for the contravention of which penalties were provided.

What is the logical bond of union between the disparate members of this body of rules? Why, in particular, was the supervision of the Egyptian clergy an affair of the *ἰδιος λόγος*? Does the name of the department contain any implication with regard to its scope and function? To these very pertinent questions Plaumann has endeavoured to supply an answer. We must, he argues, put aside the notion that *ἰδιος λόγος* means the 'privy purse' either of the Ptolemies or the Roman emperors, and interpret it rather in the sense of 'special account'. When we read in the papyrus of 112 B.C. above mentioned that the fine exacted from Senpoëris was paid into the bank at Hermonthis *εἰς τὸν ἰδιον λόγον τῶν βασιλέων* this does not mean that it was

credited to the 'private account of the crown', but to a special crown account kept for casual and irregular receipts. The *ἀδέσποτα* belong to this account because they are windfalls—sometimes in the literal sense of the word. Forfeitures and lapses, too, form no part of the current revenue of which an approximate estimate can be formed. And when we come to examine the sections of the Gnomon which bear on ecclesiastical matters we shall find that the *raison d'être* of the minute regulation of public worship is the revenue accruing to the treasury partly from the sale of offices of profit, partly from the exaction of fines for neglect of duty or breach of observances. I think, then, that Plaumann is justified in contending that all revenues not derived from regular taxation, whether direct or indirect, were swept into this 'special account'. It is not quite so clear whether the administration of crown property, especially that of the imperial domains, fell within the province of the *ἴδιος λόγος*. There was, as we know, an *οὔσιακὸς λόγος* or 'estates account', which was credited with the revenues of crown lands, and its relation to the *ἴδιος λόγος* remains a matter of dispute. Certainly the *γνώμων* in its present form has nothing to say on the subject of the *οὐσίαι*, nor can there have been room for a section dealing with them in the missing portion of the roll, which was not long. It is no doubt true that our Gnomon is but an abridgement of a part of the Code of Augustus, but we should remark, I think, that in the first place the accumulation of *οὐσίαι* in the hands of Caesar was a process which only had its beginning in his reign, and in the second place many of the most important, such as those of Maecenas, were acquired by inheritance and not by confiscation. It seems better therefore to regard the 'estates account' as a separate department, to which no

doubt such confiscated properties as were not sold by auction or private treaty were transferred by the *ιδιος λόγος*.

Under the Empire, then, the *ιδιος λόγος*, was in theory a special branch of the imperial treasury in Egypt. In practice it was more than this. It furnished the Government with a powerful, if indirect, lever in dealing with the social and even with the religious life of the country ; and it soon became a finished instrument of fiscal oppression. To begin with, it supplied the means whereby the rigid hierarchy of classes and races characteristic of Egypt under Roman rule (as of course under that which preceded it) was maintained. At the upper end of the scale we have the *cives Romani*, at first mainly the official class with a thin sprinkling of traders and land-agents, constantly recruited from the ranks of the army by the grant of *civitas* on discharge, and from the servile population by the practice of manumission, although many of the freedmen attained only to the inferior status of *Latinitas* acquired by those informally manumitted. At the lower end came the native Egyptian population, the ancestors of the modern fellahin, whose subjection was symbolized by the payment of the poll-tax. But between the two extremes there was a nice gradation of privilege and status. Next to the Roman and the Latin came the burgher of Alexandria, though even within that citizen-body there were fine shades of privilege which need not now concern us. Then the *ἀστοί*, or members of the other Greek communities, Ptolemais, Naucratis, and Hadrian's foundation of Antinoupolis : next the Hellenized element in the *μητροπόλεις* or urban centres of the *νομοί*, whose hallmark was the Greek education obtained in the *γυμνάσιον*, eagerly sought after by those who desired to rise in the

social scale ; lastly, next above the mass of the fellahin of the smaller villages, a class whose privilege consisted in the payment of reduced rates of poll-tax. It was incumbent upon the imperial bureaucracy to see to it that the boundaries which divided these classes, each of which lived under its own system of law, the *πολιτικοὶ νόμοι* of Alexandria, the *ἀστικοὶ νόμοι* of other urban foundations, and the *ἐπιχώριος νόμος* of the Graeco-Egyptian community, were not overstepped. This end was attained by an elaborate system of registration of persons and property (*αἱ κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφαί*) ; by a searching examination into the credentials of those who put forward claims to any privileged status (*ἐπίκρισις*) ; by insistence on the most rigid accuracy in the nomenclature and description of individuals named in legal instruments (*χρηματισμός*) ; and by the application of complicated rules regarding intermarriage and inheritance. Failure to comply with such rules and regulations, as the Gnomon shows, entailed heavy penalties, sometimes even the forfeiture of the defaulter's estate, and it was the business of the *ἴδιος λόγος*, through his ubiquitous agents, to see that these were exacted. For instance, those who used false designations in legal documents were guilty of the offence described in the Gnomon as *ἀκαταλληλία* (a word which is not unfamiliar to those who have studied that dreariest work of Greek prose literature, the treatise of Apollonius Dyscolus on syntax, in the sense of a 'false concord'), and, together with such as append their signatures wittingly to the same instrument, are liable to the confiscation of one-fourth of their property—a fact which shows why it was necessary to apply to the *ἴδιος λόγος* for leave to exchange an Egyptian for a Greek name. It was the business of the *ἴδιος λόγος*, again, to sweep into the net of the *fiscus*

intestate estates, lapsed bequests to unqualified persons, and the like, and to defeat the ingenious contrivances by which it was sought to evade the law. To give an example: among the precedents recorded in the Cattaoui papyrus is the decision given by an unnamed *ἴδιος λόγος* in A.D. 136 in the case of one Cornelia, accused by informers of being in unlawful possession of seven slaves given her by her husband Acutianus in violation of the principle of Roman law, which forbade *donatio inter virum et uxorem*. The *ἴδιος λόγος* ruled, in accordance with the leading cases decided by various viceroys of Egypt, that as the marriage of soldiers was forbidden, the gifts made by Acutianus to Cornelia during his term of service were valid, while those posterior to his discharge were void. But Cornelia was not content with defeating the informer: she came into court once more and sued her husband for money placed with him on deposit. The *ἴδιος λόγος*, however, knew his business: had not Rutilius Lupus, praefect of Egypt under Hadrian, made short shrift of a similar suit in the *dictum* delivered in the case of Macrina *v.* Germanus: 'we know perfectly well that "deposit" means "dowry",' thereby disposing of one of the ingenious fictions by which it was sought to render nugatory the prohibition of marriage on service? So common did such evasions of the law become, that certain classes of cases were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the *ἴδιος λόγος* and reserved for the cognizance of the praefect: the Gnomon tells us that this had recently been done in the case of fraudulent attempts to claim the citizenship of Alexandria, which was particularly valuable, since, as we know from the correspondence of Pliny with Trajan,¹ it was the necessary stepping-stone to the Roman *civitas* for the

¹ *Ep. ad Traj.* 6 (22), 7 (23).

Graeco-Egyptian; and it so happens that we find precisely such a case, tried in the year A.D. 142, in the collection of precedents above referred to.

It was therefore necessary for the ἰδιος λόγος to possess a working knowledge of the principles of the *ius civile* and still more of the *ius gentium*: and some portions of our abstract of the Gnomon cover ground which is familiar to us in the Institutes of Gaius, written, no doubt, within the years of the date of the papyrus, since the first book mentions Antoninus Pius as living; whereas in the second he is numbered with the gods. The result of the comparison of Gaius with the Gnomon and of both with other papyri is to show that neither work can pretend to completeness or accuracy. There are enactments recorded in the Gnomon which would naturally have found a place in the Institutes: as, for example, that the provisions of the *Leges Julia et Papia Poppaea*, which disqualified unmarried or childless persons from benefiting under a will, did not apply to estates of less than 100,000 HS. in the case of a man or of 50,000 HS. in that of a woman. Again, the Gnomon tells us that Vespasian confiscated inheritances left in trust by Greeks for Romans or by Romans for Greeks; but that one-half was allowed to be retained by those who admitted full liability and did not seek to evade the law. Gaius tells us (ii. 285) that *peregrini* were formerly able to benefit by *fidei commissa*, and that this was in fact the chief motive for the creation of such trusts, but that this was 'afterwards' prohibited (no date being given); further, that in his own time, by a *Senatus consultum* passed *ex oratione divi Hadriani*, property so bequeathed was liable to confiscation by the *fiscus*. How these statements are to be reconciled must be left to the lawyer. To take one more example, the grant of

bonorum possessio unde cognati by Hadrian in A.D. 119 to the descendants of soldiers dying intestate, which was known to us from a Berlin papyrus¹ and is referred to in paragraph 35 of the Gnomon, is omitted by Gaius. On the other hand, we do not find in the Gnomon, where we should most certainly expect it (although we do not look for it in Gaius), any allusion to the same emperor's grant of *ἐπιγαμία* with Egyptians to the citizens of his new foundation of Antinoë, nor to his rescript allowing Egyptians to succeed to the intestate estate of a grandmother, referred to in a Berlin papyrus edited by Mommsen.²

We find, however, some compensation for these omissions in the clauses which show how the principles of Roman law were extended by analogy to cases arising from the special conditions of mixed nationality in Egypt. Thus the principle of *erroris causae probatio*, by which a marriage contracted through a *bona fide* mistake by persons of unequal condition may, on proof of justifiable error, lead to the acquisition of *civitas* by the parties and their issue, was applied, as paragraph 47 shows, to mixed marriages contracted *κατ' ἀγνοίαν* between *ἀσχαί* and Egyptians. On the other hand we have two provisions (paragraphs 39 and 46) relating to mixed marriages to which Roman citizens are parties, which are very hard to bring into agreement, since in the earlier section the child is said to acquire its father's nationality, while in the latter the case is governed by the rule of *Lex Minicia*, that where either parent is a *peregrinus* the child follows the inferior condition; and this principle is applied by paragraph 57 to the case of marriages between the inhabitants of

¹ *B. G. U.* 140; Mitteis, *Chrest.* 373.

² *Gesammelte Schriften*, i. 456 ff.; Bruns, *Fontes*?, p. 410.

Paraetonium and ἀλλόφυλοι or Egyptians. It is to be hoped that the sections of the papyrus relating to marriage, inheritance, and the status of persons will receive the attention which they merit from students of Roman law; for the Berlin editors have not even provided us with a reliable translation. In paragraph 20 the Gnomon, alluding to the well-known provision of the *Lex Aelia Sentia*, by which a slave who has been put in chains cannot acquire on manumission a status higher than that of a *peregrinus dediticius*, states that bequests made by such freedmen are confiscated. Schubart's rendering, 'a slave born in chains,' is a palpable and indeed absurd error. It is somewhat surprising to find so learned a scholar, in his recently published *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, quoting the introductory sentence of the Gnomon in order to to show that decrees of the Senate had force in Egypt, though an imperial appanage; the fact of course being that the writer refers to *Senatus consulta* such as the *S. C. Claudianum* or *S. C. Pegasianum* which laid down rules of private law.

Nor is it only the lawyer who will find matter of interest in the sections dealing with the status of persons. Sidelights are thrown upon the manners and customs of Roman Egypt. In the Athens of Menander a child exposed at birth was placed in a pot or cradle with a packet of keepsakes, which might furnish its parents with the means of future identification. In the villages of Egypt a more summary method was followed. The infant was deposited on the village rubbish-heap or κοπρία, together with the household refuse and the (to us) priceless fragments of classical literature; and, as several papyri of the first century show, it was a common practice to appropriate such an infant and put it out to nurse. It was not long before the practice attracted the

attention of the ἴδιος λόγος. The snapper-up of such unconsidered trifles as male infants forgot that these ownerless homunculi were ἀδέσποτα, and as such the property of the *fiscus*¹; and by paragraph 107 of the Gnomon one-fourth of their worldly goods was rendered liable to confiscation!

Even the theologian may carry grist to his mill from the pages of this document. It appears from paragraph 47 that the term ἀπαρχή was technically used in the sense of a certificate of registration showing that the holder was of free birth, as opposed to the οἰκογένεια, which was the identity-paper of one born a slave; and this usage seems to throw a new light upon the phrase ἀπαρχὴ πνεύματος in Rom. viii. 23, usually translated 'the firstfruits of the Spirit'. When we read the passage which begins at verse 16, we see that St. Paul is here arguing that our claim to spiritual freedom is based on the witness of the Spirit to our sonship, just as in Egypt the μαρτυροποίησις of the parent was among the documents put in evidence in the procedure of ἐπίκρισις by which claims to privileged status were judged; and that in spite of this—in spite of the fact that we have, as it were, obtained through the mediation of the Spirit the certificate which entitles us to be registered as the sons of God—we are still awaiting our formal release from the bondage of the flesh and the law.

It will be convenient at this point to mention briefly the miscellaneous provisions grouped together in the closing section of the Gnomon, with which may be classed the regulations concerning passports and the export of slaves—regulations so stringent and involving such heavy penalties that the cases had recently been transferred to the cognizance of the praefect. Through-

¹ Schubart, *Einführung*, p. 466: P. M. Meyer gives a different explanation.

out these sections the exaction of penalties for breach of administrative regulations is the determining factor. Paragraph 100, for instance, establishes a scale of fines for failure on the part of notaries (*συναλλαγματογράφοι*) to register deeds at Alexandria within a limit of time varying according to the distance of the place where the contract was passed, and the paragraph immediately following imposes a penalty of 50 dr. on notaries who draw up mortgages or conveyances without previously obtaining the authorization (*ἐπίσταλμα*) of the land-registry at Alexandria, a practice forbidden (but without specified penalty) in the Edict issued by Mettius Rufus, praefect under Domitian, a copy of which is included in the collection of documents known as the Petition of Dionysia.¹ Next to this comes a paragraph which licenses Gymnasiarchs of Alexandria, in case of need, to import oil (no doubt from Syria) and to sell the surplus at the controlled price; if they fail to comply they are liable to the confiscation of their stocks and to the heavy penalty of 20 tal. for the violation of the Government monopoly.² A little farther on we come to provisions which forbid certain classes of civil servants to buy Government property sold at auction or to acquire provincial land, the latter prohibition being extended to those on military service. These instances will suffice to show at once the variety of topics dealt with in the code, and the guiding principle which unites them.

We must now turn to the sections which deal with the ecclesiastical affairs. It must be left to Egypto-

¹ *P. Oxy.* 237, viii. 27 ff.; Mitteis, *Chrest.* 192.

² Paragraph 105 fixes the maximum rate of interest for loans at 12 per cent., the penalty for the infraction of this rule being the confiscation of one-half of the creditor's and one-quarter of the debtor's estate.

logists to estimate the value of these paragraphs for the study of later Egyptian religion : our object is to deduce from the Gnomon the part played by the ἴδιος λόγος in the regulation of public worship. The notion that the controller of this department was the head of the State-Church seems at first sight to be confirmed by the regulations laid down with regard to the ordering of the sacred processions (κωμασίσαι), the duties and privileges of the various ranks of the clergy and temple-attendants and so forth ; but the more closely we examine these the more clear it becomes that here, as elsewhere, the fiscal interest predominates, and that the exaction of penalties (πρόστιμα) is the main object in view. The fact is that, as Rostowzew divined, the Egyptian Church under the Empire was 'no longer a political factor, but a fiscal instrument'. With the regular revenue derived from the γῆ ἱερὰ, the eminent domain in which was reserved to the emperors as it had been to the Ptolemies, the ἴδιος λόγος, so far as we are able to tell, had nothing to do ; but apart from this there were considerable receipts to be derived from the fines paid by the *personnel* of the temples for the infraction of regulations. Reference has already been made to a papyrus dating from the end of the reign of Antoninus Pius which tells us of an information laid against a priest who wore woollen garments and allowed his hair to grow long. Now the very first paragraph of the ecclesiastical section of the Gnomon (paragraph 71) reads : 'It is not lawful for priests to engage in any business other than the service of the gods nor to appear in woollen garments nor to wear long hair, even if they are removed from the divine Psar'.¹ A few

¹ I do not venture to interpret this word, which occurs twice in the Gnomon. The editors suggest that it may be connected with

lines later (paragraph 75) we read: 'A priest was fined 200 dr. for neglecting his religious duties, and 200 dr. for wearing woollen garments: a piper was fined 100, a pastophoros 100.' And in the following paragraph (76) we are told that 'a priest who wore woollen garments and long hair was fined as much as 1000 dr.' Evidently it is the scale of fines which is of chief interest to the *ἴδιος λόγος*. In the light of this fact we must interpret the clauses which relate to the status and privileges of the various orders of the Egyptian clergy. Before the discovery of the Gnomon, Rostowzew had shown that in Roman Egypt the administration of temple property was in the hands of a collegiate body usually called *πρεσβύτεροι*, who had taken the place of the *ἐπιστάται*, or wardens, of Ptolemaic times. This was in accordance with the Roman practice of setting up quasi-corporate bodies jointly and severally responsible to the Government wherever fiscal interests were at stake. Of such bodies and their relations with the central administration the Gnomon has nothing to tell us. But the conduct of public worship was in the hands of a carefully graded hierarchy, the first order in dignity being that of *προφῆται*, who, if we may trust Clement of Alexandria, were responsible for the due performance of ritual. Next in order came the *στολισταί*, whose name denotes the keepers of the wardrobe belonging to the images of the gods; but besides this it seems that the sacred vessels and other properties were under their care. In the absence of *προφῆται* they were empowered to undertake their functions. Only these two orders were entitled to be described as *ιερείς*: the

the Coptic *shar*, which properly means 'leather' and might be used of a 'roll' of the clergy; but the Reader in Egyptology informs me that this is improbable on philological grounds.

παστοφόροι, who carried the shrines containing the images of the gods in processions (*κωμασίαι*), are forbidden by the Gnomon to describe themselves officially as priests, while on the other hand they are permitted to occupy posts open to laymen.

Besides these, there are still lower grades, whose precedence is strictly regulated. Those who bury the sacred animals, says the Gnomon, may not be *προφήται*, nor may they carry shrines in procession—in other words, they may not be *παστοφόροι*—nor even tend the animals whom it is their duty to bury. Now these are all offices of profit. Sometimes their holders enjoy *πρόσοδοι*, whose nature is not stated, but which are seemingly charged upon the temple revenues, since we read in the Gnomon that in every sacred precinct where there is a *ναός* there must be a *προφήτης*, and he is entitled to receive one-fifth of the *πρόσοδοι*. The incomes of the *στολισταί*, again, were derived from this corporate revenue: a *στολιστής* who neglected his duties was mulcted in his *πρόσοδοι* as well as in a sum of 300 dr. We also hear of *συντάξεις*, which appear to be fixed salaries, and perquisites (*γέρα*). And it is expressly stated that the victims consumed at the sacrificial feasts called *κλῖναι* are not partaken of by the *προφήται*, but by the *παστοφόροι*. The reason why these provisions are mentioned in the Gnomon is no doubt because the *ἱδὸς λόγος* was concerned, not directly with the maintenance of the cult as such, but with the status of the various grades of ministrants, partly because the posts to which emoluments were attached were sold by the Government, sometimes, though not always, by auction, partly, no doubt, because pecuniary penalties attached to any attempt to usurp the title or privileges of a higher grade. Interspersed amongst the regulations for the clergy are

other provisions concerning fines, i.e. we hear that those who fail to supply the necessary shrouds for the burial of an Apis or a Mnevis are mulcted in a *πρόστιμον*, the amount of which is not given; and 500 dr. is exacted (apparently, though the expression is obscure) for the dedication of votive offerings without permission.

It has been necessary to insist upon this point at some length because the current view is that the *ἴδιος λόγος* not merely supervised the temple-cults of Egypt, but was in one of his capacities actually identical with the *ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Αἰγύπτου πάσης*, for whose existence we have epigraphic evidence. That such a variety of functions should be brought under the competence of a single Department of State is not in itself impossible: the Prussian Ministry of 'Education, Public Worship, and Medicine' might be quoted as a modern parallel. But the case is far from clear. Those who, like Paul Meyer and Plaumann, have compiled lists of the *ἴδιοι λόγοι*, have assumed the identity of this official with the *ἀρχιερεὺς*, and therefore included the bearers of this latter title in their tables; but if we analyse these, the following facts emerge:

(i) There is no document belonging to the first two centuries of the Christian era in which the two titles are combined; the only example (to be considered later) belongs to the year A.D. 234.

(ii) Such facts as we know of the careers of the holders of these offices suggest that they belonged to different branches of the imperial service. The *ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Αἰγύπτου πάσης* mentioned in an inscription from the neighbourhood of Rome¹ was a well-known scholar, by name L. Julius Vestinus. Besides the high priesthood, he held at various times the offices of Presi-

¹ O. G. I. 679.

dent of the Museum, Librarian of the Greek and Latin Libraries in Rome, Director of Studies to Hadrian, and Secretary-in-chief (*ab epistulis*) to the same emperor. He was an industrious lexicographer, who published notes on the vocabulary of Thucydides and the Attic Orators, and wrote an epitome of the Glossary of Pamphilus. Now let us turn to the ἱδίοι λόγοι. M. Vergilius Gallus, *idiologus ad Aegyptum* under Tiberius, is known to us from an inscription of his native town of Venafrum.¹ He was an ex-centurion (*primus pilus*), who had held the command of various auxiliary regiments before being promoted to the post of *idiologus*. At the close of the second century and beginning of the third we hear of T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides, who, after his military service as *tribunus militum*, was successively *procurator ad census* in Aquitania, procurator in Lower Moesia, in Thrace, and in Dalmatia, before holding the office of ἱδίου λόγος. A few years later P. Aelius Sempronius Lycinus, who is known to us from an inscription set up in his honour at Ancyra, after performing the *militiae equestres*, was procurator in the department of the *vicesima hereditatum* in Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitania, procurator in Dacia Porolissensis, and then *idiologus* at Alexandria (with a salary of 200,000 sesterces), before being promoted to the procuratorship of Palestine. Both these officials, then, belonged to the financial branch of the service, and by their connexion with assessments and the collection of the succession duty were well fitted to take up the duties of the *idiologus*.

(iii) Nothing that we know of the ἱδίοι λόγοι prior to the reign of Hadrian suggests that they were concerned with the supervision of public worship, but in his reign

² C. I. L. x. 4862; Dessau, 2690.

we find—if a probable restoration of Plaumann's be accepted—that the ἴδιος λόγος Marcius Moesianus sold a *προφητεία*, and Ti. Claudius Justus, who presided over this department under Antoninus Pius, was concerned in a similar transaction. But this, after all, is only what we should expect, since the function of the ἴδιος λόγος was to realize the assets belonging to the Imperial Government. Nor is it surprising that Pardalas, ἴδιος λόγος under Hadrian, who happens to be named in § 23 of the Gnomon as having confiscated the property of *cives Romani*—no doubt of Egyptian extraction—who contravened the prohibition of marriage between brother and sister, should also, as a Berlin papyrus¹ shows, have laid down the rule that a certificate must always be given by the *μοσχοσφραγισταί*, or examiners of victims, before a calf was sacrificed, since (although the Gnomon omits to inform us of the fact) it may safely be assumed that a fine was imposed for failure to procure the licence; Claudius Justus, too, who has been mentioned above, may probably be identified with the official mentioned in a British Museum papyrus,² who sequestered the *πρόσοδοι* and *συντάξεις* (words which seem appropriate to the stipends and emoluments of the clergy) of the plaintiffs in a suit which came before him, and threatened to impose a penalty of 200 dr. in the event of non-compliance with an order of his court. Thus the functions exercised by the ἴδιοι λόγοι in the ecclesiastical sphere, so far as the papyri throw light upon them, are just what we should expect of an official concerned with getting in revenue from miscellaneous sources and in particular from fines.

(iv) We know of no ἀρχιερεύς earlier than L. Julius Vestinus, but from the latter half of the second

¹ B. G. U. 258; Wilcken, *Chrest.* 8.

² P. Lond. 2. 359 (p. 150).

century there are four papyri¹ which mention this official, and in every case he receives applications from priests for leave to circumcise their sons in order that they may be qualified to follow the father's profession. This is natural enough if the ἀρχιερεύς was responsible for maintaining the *personnel* of the cult: there is no good reason why the ἰδιος λόγος should be concerned, as there were apparently no fees to collect, and it is an unproved assumption that that official is in these papyri described as ἀρχιερεύς because he is acting in his ecclesiastical capacity.

On the whole, then, the balance of probability seems to be against the identification of the offices of ἀρχιερεύς and ἰδιος λόγος, so far as the period anterior to the Severi is concerned. The conditions prevailing under that dynasty and in the third century require, however, a closer examination, and must be considered under a broader aspect. We are gradually coming to recognize more clearly the important part played by Severus and Caracalla (assisted no doubt by technical advisers, including the great lawyers of the period) in the remodelling and simplification of the imperial administration. Nowhere, of course, were these changes thus brought about more far-reaching than in Egypt, where the institution of municipal councils in Alexandria and the μητροπόλεις of the nomes by Septimius Severus in A.D. 202 and the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in A.D. 212 removed the most striking of the anomalies which gave Egypt its exceptional position among the provinces. The acquisition of the Roman *civitas* by the upper strata of the population put an end to the elaborate

¹ *P. Strassb.* 60, Wilcken, *Chrest.* 77 (A.D. 149); *P. Rain.* 121, *Sammelb.*, 15-17 (A.D. 155-6); *P. Teb.* 291, Wilcken, *Chrest.* 76 (A.D. 171); *B. G. U.* 82 (A.D. 185-6).

gradation of privilege which had hitherto been maintained by the system of registration and penalties, leaving only the well-marked distinction between the *cives Romani* and the native *dediticii*, who, as the Giessen fragment of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* has shown, were excepted from the grant.

But these measures by no means exhausted the administrative reforms of the time, especially in the sphere of finance. Here we must touch upon the difficult question of the new department created by Septimius Severus under the name of the *res privata*. The biographer of Severus in the *Historia Augusta*¹ seems to connect this with the immense confiscations which followed the suppression of the rebellions of Niger and Albinus; and it has been very generally held that this *res privata* was a new 'privy purse', for which the Egyptian *ἴδιος λόγος* served as the model. But the discovery of the Gnomon has put a different complexion upon this matter. If the *ἴδιος λόγος* itself was not a 'privy purse', but a 'special account', it clearly cannot have been the prototype of the *res privata*; moreover, had it been so, we should certainly have expected to find it growing in importance from the time of Severus onwards. But this is so far from being the case that there is only one mention of the office later than the reign of Septimius Severus, and that is contained in the packet of monthly returns made by a village official in A. D. 234 to the *ἐπιτροπή τοῦ ἰδιολόγου καὶ ἀρχιερέως*, relating to the punctual performance of duty by the local clergy.² These documents furnish at once the latest reference to the *ἴδιος λόγος* and the only definite identification (if it be in fact an identifica-

¹ *Vita Severi* 12.

² One of these is published by Wilcken, *Chrest.* 72.

tion) of that official with the ἀρχιερεύς.¹ Is it possible that, owing to the far-reaching reorganization of the imperial finances by Septimius Severus and the lightening of the task of registration brought about by the Edict of Caracalla, the ἴδιος λόγος was now mainly concerned with ecclesiastical matters, and that his office was regularly combined with that of the High Priest? It seems not unlikely. The administration of Egypt, as indeed of the whole Empire, was thoroughly overhauled under Severus, who was indifferent to constitutional forms and official traditions, and was inspired by the desire to simplify the machinery and centralize the direction of the bureaucracy. There is some evidence, which we may briefly consider, tending to show that the various departments in Egypt were thrown into the melting-pot during this period. It used to be supposed that the official known in Greek as the καθολικός (i.e. the head of the department of οἱ καθ' ὅλου λόγοι or *summae rationes*) and in Latin as *rationalis*, was called into existence by Diocletian, but we know that he belongs to a much earlier date. A papyrus of the year A.D. 246² mentions one Claudius Marcellus, ὁ διασημότατος καθολικός, i.e. *vir perfectissimus rationalis*, and a *procurator*, Marcius Salutaris, in connexion with the sale of unproductive land; and the same two persons are named in an undated Oxyrhynchus papyrus,³ also in

¹ The phrase ἡ τοῦ ἰδιολόγου καὶ ἀρχιερέως ἐπιτροπή is naturally thus interpreted: but it is just possible that the expression is a compound one meaning 'that branch of the ἴδιος λόγος concerned with ecclesiastical matters' (which would of course be in constant relation with the ἀρχιερεύς). So in *P. Amh.* 69, Wilcken, *Chrest.* 190, ὁ τοῦ νομοῦ ἐκλογιστῆς καὶ ἴδιος λόγος may indicate that branch of the office of the ἐκλογιστής (who was primarily an official of the διοίκησις) which is concerned with receipts on account of the ἴδιος λόγος.

² *P. Lond.* iii. 1157 (p. 110), Wilcken, *Chrest.* 375. ³ *P. Oxy.* 78.

connexion with the registration of a sale of land. Now the first case, at any rate, is one where we should have expected to find the ἴδιος λόγος concerned. But even as early as A. D. 202 we find a similar pair of officials, Claudius Julianus (the restoration is practically certain), who is simply called ὁ διασημότατος (*vir perfectissimus*) and a *procurator* named Claudius Diognetus, concerned with a survey of the γῆ κυριακή or imperial domain-land.¹ The same Claudius Julianus, ὁ διασημότατος, is mentioned in another papyrus² as condemning a criminal to five years' penal servitude in the alabaster quarries in A. D. 204. Now this raises a very serious question. The title *vir perfectissimus* belongs to the praefect of Egypt, and, like the provincial governors possessing the *ius gladii*, he is alone competent to inflict the penalty of penal servitude in the mines or quarries; but Claudius Julianus was not praefect of Egypt at this time, for that office was held by Subatianus Aquila, nor, it will be observed, does he bear any title except that of ὁ διασημότατος, so that we can hardly assume him to have been the first of the καθολικοί, to say nothing of the difficulty of supposing that a *rationalis* could pass a sentence of penal servitude. Now Arthur Stein has identified this person, very probably, with the Claudius Julianus who is called *vir perfectissimus praefectus annonae* in an inscription of the year A. D. 201 found in Rome (the earliest inscription, by the way, in which the title *vir perfectissimus* has been noted),³ and I venture to hazard the suggestion that he was sent to Egypt as a special commissioner with powers co-ordinate with those of the praefect in order to carry through the reorganization of

¹ *P. Giss.* 48; Wilcken, *Chrest.* 171.

² *Berl. Sitzungsber.*, 1910, 713; *Sammelb.*, 4639.

³ *C. I. L.* vi. 1603; Dessau, 1346.

the administration. Moreover we know something of his coadjutor, Claudius Diognetus, described as ὁ κράτιστος ἐπίτροπος Σεβαστῶν, i. e. *vir egregius, procurator Augustorum*. In 196-7 he was acting as deputy-ἀρχιερεύς—διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην—and in that capacity sold a post as στολιστής; and in A. D. 202 he issues instructions concerning land which is ἄβροχος, i. e. has not been reached by the inundation of the Nile, as we learn from a papyrus of Philadelpheia in the Fayum,¹ the only papyrus connected with this subject of γῆ ἄβροχος, in which the praefect of Egypt is passed over. Whether he bore any title other than *procurator Augustorum* it is hard to say: it has been suggested that he was ἐπίτροπος τῶν οὐσιακῶν—*procurator* of the imperial estates—on the ground that a papyrus of A. D. 214-5 mentions an official of that rank as deputy-ἀρχιερεύς; but this is not conclusive, especially in this period of transition. Again, it is not without significance that as late as A. D. 221, as we learn from an Oxyrhynchus papyrus,² the sum of 2255 dr. proceeding from fines levied for failure to register titles within the prescribed period, which, as the Gnomon has shown, undoubtedly belonged to the ἴδιος λόγος in the Antonine period, is paid into a bank with instructions that it is to be kept in a special account (ιδίας τάξεως) until its destination is decided. In short, the evidence is in favour of a considerable decline in the importance of the ἴδιος λόγος owing to the reforms of the Severi; and this leaves us free to accept the view that the creation of the *res privata* was a far more revolutionary change than was formerly supposed, namely, that it set up a centralized treasury into which flowed the revenues of all the domain lands, including, of course, those of the *fiscus*. It is certain that, although the *patrimonium* of the

¹ *P. Hamb.* 11.² *P. Oxy.* 61.

emperors continued to exist, with its special staff of officials, the Egyptian *οὐσίαι* are from the reign of Severus onwards described as belonging to the *ἱερώτατον ταμειῶν*, which is the proper equivalent of the *fiscus*: certain, too, that in the Codes *fundi fiscales* or *praedia fiscalia* are identical with *fundi* or *praedia rei privatae*: certain, that the *comes rei privatae* of the system of Constantine, who is the successor of the *procurator rei privatae* of Severus, dealt with *bona vacantia* and *caduca*. It is to be noted that the earliest *procurator* of the *res privata* of whom we have knowledge is no less a person than Sextus Varius Marcellus, the husband of Julia Soaemias and father of the Emperor Elagabalus, who, having been successively *procurator centenarius* of the aqueducts of Rome and *procurator ducenarius* of the province of Britain, then held the newly created office as *trecenarius*, enjoying the salary of 300,000 HS. reserved for the highest ranks of the service, and was directly promoted from this post to the wholly exceptional position of *vice praefecti praetorio et praefecti urbi*,¹ in which capacity he acted as vice-gerent of Caracalla during the emperor's absence in the East; also that the future Emperor Macrinus was *procurator rei privatae* before his promotion by Caracalla to the praefecture of the guard, and that Timesitheus, the favourite and father-in-law of Gordian III, was *procurator tam patrimonii quam rerum privatarum*. Pliny the younger, in addressing his Panegyric to Trajan, had contrasted *fiscus* and *aerarium* as *tuum* and *publicum*: it was left for Severus to draw the inevitable deduction.

The argument has led us away from the Gnomon. Let us in conclusion return to the document from which we found our point of departure—the Edict of Ti.

¹ C. I. L. x. 6569, Dessau 478; cf. Dio Cass. 78. 30.

Julius Alexander. Tiberius Julius Alexander was one of those secondary characters in the history of the Early Empire of whom we would gladly know more. He came of a distinguished Jewish stock, though he was not himself loyal to the faith of his fathers. His brother was the husband of Berenice, daughter of King Herod Agrippa I, his uncle was Philo the philosopher—if I dare call him by that name—and if we accept the conjecture that he is the Alexander to whom the tract *de Mundo* included in the Aristotelian corpus was dedicated, he himself was not without interest in speculative problems: but his talents were rather of the practical and especially the financial order, so that we may fairly say that his family, in the person of its two most distinguished representatives, exemplified the dual mentality of the race which gave us a Rothschild and a Spinoza. As Chief of the Staff (or rather perhaps Quartermaster-General) to Corbulo in the Armenian wars under Nero and to Titus during the Siege of Jerusalem he proved himself an organizer of victory, and his edict shows him to have been not only an expert in finance, but also an able and enlightened ruler. His edict bears witness to a genuine desire to eradicate the abuses which had become rampant in the administration of Egypt towards the close of the reign of Nero, and contains several wise and statesmanlike provisions, which must not detain us: we are concerned only with those which relate to the *ἰδιος λόγος*. Alexander tells us—what is easy to believe—that this department was infested by those twin pests of bureaucratic governments, the bullying and blackmailing official and the professional informer. The praefect lays down some excellent rules for dealing with these abuses. It seems that vexatious prosecutions were constantly being

brought against taxpayers and renewed time after time, although they had been dismissed by the praefect on circuit, simply for purposes of blackmail. With a touch of Oriental hyperbole, Alexander asserts that 'the city' (by which he means Alexandria) is left almost without inhabitants owing to the plague of *συκοφάνται*; and he orders firstly, that cases once decided by the head of the department shall not be reopened; secondly, that no professional informer shall appear as the advocate of another party, unless that party also puts in an appearance in person, so that he can be held responsible; thirdly, that any prosecutor who fails to make good his case three times in succession shall be punished by the confiscation of one-half of his property. And he then continues, in the passage from which we set out in our examination of the question *καὶ καθόλου δὲ ἐπικελεύσομαι τὸν γνῶμονα τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου* (after this a *short* word has been lost) *τὰ καινοποιηθέντα παρὰ τὰς τῶν Σεβαστῶν χάριτας ἐπανορθῶσαι*. Dittenberger, who supposed that *γνῶμων* was the official title of the Controller inserted *αἰ* in the lacuna; the effect being to make the passage mean 'I will give general orders that the Controller of the *ἴδιος λόγος* is always to correct, i. e. to set aside, such innovations as have been made in contravention of the privileges granted by the emperors.' But we now see that a preposition—perhaps *πρός* as Schubart has suggested or possibly *κατά*—must be inserted and that Alexander's words meant 'I will give orders to restore the original provisions of the Gnomon, in respect of these innovations which have been made in contravention of imperial grants.'

Whether the reforms of Alexander produced any lasting effect it is hard to say. The net of the *fiscus* seems to have tightened under such emperors as

Vespasian and Trajan ; and in the long-drawn battle of wits between the taxpayer and the Government the latter held the trump cards and played them without remorse. Let one example suffice. The very first paragraph of the Gnomon records that when an estate was confiscated by the *fiscus*, the family graves were by custom exempted : but that Trajan, finding that this led to evasions, confiscated the *κηποταφεία*¹ or private burial grounds and such-like and left only the actual tombs to the family of the defaulter. We should scarcely have understood the point of this provision but for the fact that some Alexandrian papyri² show that such *κηποταφεία* were regularly leased at high rentals to market-gardeners ! As to the practices of the informers our evidence is scanty : but it is worth remembering that in the case of Cornelia *v.* Acutianus, which was quoted above, the original charge is described as a *συκοφαντώδης κατηγορία*. Nor can it, I fear, be maintained that the far-reaching administrative changes made by the Severi were dictated by any feelings of consideration for the overburdened taxpayer. On the contrary, if we knew more of them in detail we should doubtless find that they set up a landmark in the inevitable progress of the imperial bureaucracy towards the establishment of the servile State.

It is not beyond hope that we may—if fortune is once more kind to us—learn more of these changes. For there is a piece of evidence, which has not, I think, received as much attention as it deserves, showing that Septimius Severus and Caracalla substituted a revised Gnomon for that which they found in operation. A British Museum papyrus of A. D. 246 comprises two documents. The first has already been mentioned in

¹ Schubart's restoration is ingenious and seems probable.

² *B. G. U.* iv. 1120, al.

this lecture as containing the earliest mention of the *καθολικός*. The second is a specimen form (without proper names) for the use of applicants petitioning some unnamed department for instructions to be given to the land-registry at Alexandria to estop debtors from alienating real property to the prejudice of their creditors, in accordance with the law *as confirmed by the ιερώτατος γνώμων of Severus and Antoninus*. I suggest that this *γνώμων* was a more comprehensive body of regulations (having statutory force) than the code which we have been considering, and that it was issued in connexion with the establishment of a simplified and highly centralized administration into which the *ἴδιος λόγος* was absorbed. Let us hope that the sands of Egypt may some day yield us a copy.

The study of the bureaucracy of Imperial Rome may seem to some to lead us into one of the most arid wastes on the map of History and to have but a remote connexion with practical issues; and what, we are asked, is the use of such studies? Certainly I should be the last to wish to see the study of Ancient History divorced from that of modern life. I well remember listening to an inaugural lecture—or perhaps I should rather say *causerie*—delivered before this University by James Anthony Froude. The lecturer endeavoured to meet the charge that History was not a science. He quoted the question put by the jesting mathematician, ‘What does the *Iliad* prove?’—and his answer was that it was hard to say what it proved except the truth of the saying, ‘*cherchez la femme*.’ When I survey Ancient History as a whole and particularly the fate of ancient democracies—the brilliant promise and untimely end of the democracy of Athens and the process by which the nascent democracy of Rome was stifled at the birth—

I am reminded of another French saying. The lesson which these tragic happenings teach us—a lesson sadly confirmed by the comparison of 1914 with 1920—seems to me to be this, that for those who take the maiden Goddess of Liberty for their mistress, who woo her upon many a stricken field of battle and win her, it may be, at the price of their life's blood—for them the saying holds good, 'il est plus facile de mourir pour la femme qu'on aime que de vivre avec elle.'

So much for the general question. As for the special issue as it affects the subject of this lecture, a few words will suffice. It is a familiar saying—especially familiar, I doubt not, to the teachers and the taught in the Honour School of Literae Humaniores—that 'Autocracy means Bureaucracy'; and of course we all hope, and try to believe, that autocracies in the old sense are things of the past, and that when William of Hohen-zollern made his ignoble exit from the political stage, despotism tempered by—shall we say 'telegrams'?—perished from the earth. But I very much fear that we are far from having seen the last of what may be called inverted autocracies, whether they stalk naked and unashamed as Dictatorships of the Proletariat or clothe themselves in the flowing robes of the Omnicompetent State. Those autocracies, as we already see only too plainly, will bring with them their own bureaucracies, with the old tendencies and the old dangers; and unless we are warned by the experience of the most finished system of fiscal and administrative network in which humanity has ever been enmeshed, our case is likely in the end to be little better than that of the subjects of the later emperors of Rome. That is the final justification for the expenditure of time and labour in the search for such fresh light as discovery may continue to throw upon the methods of Roman bureaucracy.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Value of Byzantine and Modern Greek in Hellenic Studies

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE
DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1908

BY
SIMOS MENARDOS, D.Ph., LL.D.
UNIVERSITY LECTURER

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1909

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

THE VALUE OF BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK IN HELLENIC STUDIES

GENTLEMEN,

In starting to-day a course of lectures on Byzantine and modern Greek language and literature, I feel I must offer an apology both for myself and for my subject.

To begin with, I must justify myself for venturing to undertake in this illustrious University the task of teaching in a scientific field, cultivated now in all Europe by so many specialists and extending over a period of two thousand years. But the consciousness that by speaking on these subjects I shall deal with familiar things, that by occupying myself in these studies I shall be transferred mentally to my fatherland, encourages me to believe that my teaching, whatever else it may lack, is at least based on a cordial interest.

I also fear that my subject itself requires a justification, especially before the classically educated. The very name Byzantine has given rise to many prejudices, and the modern Greek language, owing to the smallness of the kingdom, has not a wide attractiveness.

Fortunately, the apology has become much easier in recent years. The mediaeval Greek empire is no more regarded as the degenerated heir of the Roman empire,

4 BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK

as Voltaire could think; on the contrary, Schlumberger inscribes his valuable works 'L'Épopée Byzantine', and Prof. Bury's notes to Gibbon's immortal *History* prove that Gibbon himself would nowadays have to revise many of his opinions.

But to-day we shall not deal with political, but with literary history. And the following question arises first of all; did Hellenism exercise any influence whatever on the intellectual progress of mankind from the fatal day upon which Mummius made Greece a province? I will reply, gentlemen, only with some hints.

I shall pass over the well-known story of the submission of Italy to *Graecia capta*, and shall mention only the part which Greeks played in the spread of Christianity. As a fact, those intellectual struggles which were required to impose the new religion on the political authorities and to overcome the various heresies, were internal between Greeks. Of the 318 bishops of the first Oecumenical Synod ten only came from Latin-speaking places. There is no doubt that there were also others. But no other race had then an equal authority. With Christianity the simple-minded Greeks of Asia Minor overcame the infidel sophists of Greece proper, and that victory was so complete, that the name Hellene itself, which according to Isocrates was equivalent to civilized, was banished. This significant result must have been due to many reasons, some of which were, as we shall see, simply literary. But I fear that much more often the rhetorical phrase is repeated that Plato's style is that of Jupiter, than the fact is comprehended that the holy idiom of Christianity, and perhaps of Jesus Himself, is nothing else but late Greek.

But the religious action of Hellenes—though they were no longer called Hellenes—is not confined only to the

sphere of doctrine. They established churches of a quite new description, and the temple of Saint Sophia, that is to say the Divine wisdom, is according to an English critic the best Christian Church. They adorned them with incomparable mosaics; they invented a new style of painting—the precursor of Italian art—a new music, and above all a new poetry. Romanos, one of our lyric poets, has been called the greatest of all religious poets.

Hence the religious influence of the Greeks after the foundation of Constantinople was immense, as it has been said, ‘from the mountains of Abyssinia to the mountains of Caucasus.’ The dependence of the Latin liturgy on the Greek one is obvious. But Constantinople for all the peoples of the East and the West, was, according to Diehl’s expression, *la reine des élégances*. The Armenian nation, already civilized, was taught by the Byzantines the whole liturgy, the historiography and the arts; their royal palaces at Ani, still existing, were made by Greek masons. Afterwards, the Syrians, especially the clergy, translated and imitated, not only ecclesiastical books, but also the chroniclers and some of the ancient philosophers, botanists, and medical writers. But to the other semi-barbarous peoples, who settled near the Danube and in the western, northern, and eastern coast-lands of the Black Sea, Bulgarians, Serbians, Wallachians, Russians, Georgians, the Greeks communicated not only their doctrine and liturgy, but also their music, their architecture, their hagiography, their civilization, and humanism. Greek monks invented the Slavic alphabet and translated the Bible. The Christianization of the Slavs, with the single exception of the Poles, by the Byzantines has a universal significance; because they feel themselves separate

6 BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK

from Europe to this very day, and the famous Easter question is very largely due to that action of Greeks.

But what does western Europe owe to the Byzantines? I shall not mention their long struggles against Persians, Arabs, and Seljuks, which the peoples of the West repaid by their attack on Constantinople. I shall not mention that they forced the Ottomans, as Rambaud insists, at the zenith of their power to encamp for about a century under the fortress of Constantinople before they captured her. But I shall insist on the fact that they have preserved, propagated, and interpreted the ancient literature. This fact is usually under-estimated by the critics, excited by the errata of the manuscripts and the ἀδόκιμον style. The witty Cobet used to say, 'Photius is stupid, Hesychius stupider, and Suidas stupidest of all men.'¹ But had not all these stupids preserved the ancient wisdom, what notion should we have of it? You know, gentlemen, better than I, what the mediaeval science was, the Greek seeds of which the Arabs, taking them through the Nestorian Syrians, transported to Spain. But Constantinople was always a literary centre, where some of the best epigrams of the *Anthology* were written; its majestic palace dating from the times of Constantine Porphyrogenitus to those of the last Palaeologi, recalls to mind the court of the Ptolemies. 'The Byzantines, of course, did not produce any work equivalent to the ancient masterpieces, but at least they have been the well-equipped guardians of a great literature.'

When at last the δούλιον ἡμᾶρ was approaching, and some Greek fugitives transferred their homes to Italy, their superiority became obvious. Manuel Chrysoloras, Theodore Gaza, Janus Lascaris, Demetrius Chalcondyles, Marcus Musurus, appearing at Florence, at

¹ Mnemosyne, vol. x (1861), p. 68.

Rome, at Venice, as professors, librarians, editors, and translators of Greek authors, performed for a second time, and with more success, the great work which their ancestors sixteen centuries before that had fulfilled in Rome. The result of that renaissance of Greek studies is well known ; it appeared after Italy in French, in English, in German literatures. But they did not teach letters only. They taught perhaps freedom of thinking. George Gemistus, who had been their precursor in Italy, was a great thinker, who left a deep impression. Even his eccentricity in translating his name into Plethon, became a fashion for Erasmus (Gerhard), Melancthon (Schwarzerd), Capnio (Reuchlin), Ceratinus (Hoorn), Coracopetraeus (Ravensberg), and the others. Attacking the superstitions of the clergy, he became the forerunner of the German protestantism and, initiating Platonism in the Academy of Florence, propagated the Greek adoration of beauty. Giacomo Leopardi, translating one of his orations into Italian, says, 'It is certain that Gemistus was one of the greatest and most versatile geniuses of his time, which was the fifteenth century'; and he adds, 'This nation is really admirable ; for twenty-four centuries it has been first and without parallel in civilization and literature ; while conquering, it propagated the one and the other in Asia and Africa ; when conquered, it communicated them to the other peoples of Europe. . . . In the time of the Crusades their towns, splendid with churches, squares, magnificent palaces, excellent works of art, were an unwonted sight *a genti rozze . . . quasi salvatiche e inumane*.'¹ Leopardi speaks as a great poet and scholar. My only conclusion is that the Greek race

¹ Opere di Giacomo Leopardi. Edizione da Antonio Ranieri, Firenze, 1849. Vol. ii, p. 341.

8 BYZANTINE AND MODERN GREEK

formed a great political power till the thirteenth century and maintained its intellectual hegemony as late as the fifteenth century, when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turk.

But now we may ask : For what reasons have all these facts been so long under-estimated? Why have the Byzantines been considered as declining from century to century in everything, and why has the name of Byzantium become synonymous with decay?

It is now recognized that religious and racial rivalries, owing to the schism and to the pertinacity of the Greeks in not recognizing the Western Empire, are the chief causes of that old contempt for everything Byzantine ; and, as a fact, this very name Byzantine, which the Greeks never used for themselves, was one of the epithets of the schismatics.

Prof. Krumbacher, the greatest apologist of the Byzantines, quotes in explanation of their under-estimation the words, *Weh dir, dass du ein Enkel bist.*

But I fear that there are also other causes, for which the Greeks themselves are responsible. The germ, which was sown by Gemistus and his colleagues in Italy, was purely Hellenic. From Platonism arose a latent depreciation of Christianity, and the reverse of that which happened twelve centuries before now took place. At this time the name Hellas, which these refugees pronounced with emotion, came back from banishment, and naturally Christian Greece was despised by the new Julians of the West. With Platonism an old theory revived, that of the nobility of Atticism and the barbarism of later Greek. Charles Ducange, the patriarch of Byzantinists, inscribed in 1688 his great work, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*, and in it he speaks of *vocabula barbara ac semibarbara*.

This was enough. Henceforth most of the Hellenists turned their faces away from these *scriptores*, or read them only to prove their barbarism when judged according to the standard of Attic grammar. This was easy. But the historians still more easily applied the theories of the philologists to the whole period of a thousand years. The more modern, the more barbarous and evil. But now we are obliged to change the method. The new science of language has discarded the theory of barbarism as a mere superstition ; a superstition which can no longer prevent science from entering into Byzantine history with justice and sympathy.

As the reproach of barbarism is the most serious of all those brought against the Byzantines and ourselves, I beg to deal with it at some greater length.

Barbarism is the opposite of Atticism. But what was Atticism? Thucydides used this word only in its political meaning, viz. siding with Athens. But after the defeat of Athens it meant the unrivalled Athenian civilization. It is needless to praise the Attic literature. Then all people were gifted. 'Let the boys of Thebes play the flute,' said Alcibiades ; οὐ γὰρ ἴσασι διαλέγεσθαι, because they do not know how to talk—of course, with elegance, with presence of mind, and a good deal of irony. Really, Athenians were incomparable *causeurs*. Now, as French became fashionable in the continental aristocracy from the seventeenth century, Atticism prevailed in the courts of the Diadochi and in the new large towns, which were founded during that period in Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. Then Atticism meant the Attic education, and thus the other Greek dialects, defeated by the Attic one, by-and-by expired—with the exception of the Doric, which still lives in Zakonic. The dialect, so formed, was called

κοινή; in that mixture it is not astonishing that the diphthongs began to coincide with vowels, as in Boeotia; some other dialectical pronunciations survived also in the κοινή. But of course the genuine Atticism was looked for everywhere. The triumph of Atticism took place when, after the submission of Greece, it entered into Rome herself to such an extent, that one might say, to use the language of Emilio Castelár, that Rome was inhabited by Athenian men and Athenian women. Then Atticizing Greek became a universal language, and every person who did not speak it well, was uneducated, βάρβαρος. But Cicero assures us that 'tamen eruditissimos homines Asiaticos quivis Atheniensis inductus non verbis, sed sono vocis . . . facile superavit.' Then Atticism meant rather Attic accent. How it charmed the Romans, we understand from their accepting υ, which Greeks then (and many centuries later on) pronounced like French υ—and Athenians presumably did it with a special grace. But later on, when unfortunately the Athenians had nothing that was enviable except their ancestry, Atticism meant only the style of the classic authors. The literary exquisites imitated it, as the Alexandrines had imitated Homer's verses. At the same time the ἀττικιστάι appeared; 'those self-constituted guardians of the honour of the ancient Attic,' as E. A. Sophocles styles them. Κεῖται ἢ οὐ κεῖται; is it found (in Attic authors) or not? they asked for every word. It is; then it is δόκιμον, ἀστεῖον, elegant; it is not found; then it is ἰδιωτικόν, σόλοικον, βάρβαρον. Thus Atticism became absolute pedantism. But the respect of the Greeks for their classic authors has been always so religious, that the Atticizing style withstood the contempt of the Stoa and the opposition of Christianity; and the condemnation of 'barbarism' sur-

vived with the Attic grammar till recent years. Thus the word *βάρβαρος*, which Greeks used so unjustly for other peoples, became one of evil omen to their own descendants.

Let us follow very summarily the Greek style from that time. We find at once two usages, the one *δόκιμον*, noble; the other *ἀδόκιμον*. The *δόκιμον* is, for instance, the style of Lucian, the *ἀδόκιμον* that of the Gospels. This difference, which till lately was attributed to geographical or racial causes, is proved now, after the discovery of the papyri of Upper Egypt, to be only a difference of style. Now it is clear that the style of Aelian, of Pausanias, or Plutarch himself was more or less artificial. But the style of those wily orators, who surrounded the Roman emperors, and charmed them to such an extent, that these granted them the taxes of whole provinces, was from beginning to end an artificial one. Therefore, if one asked those eloquent rhetoricians to extemporize, they could not open their mouths; because they needed many days and nights in order to patch together their phrases from the Attic orators. The poor Christians addressing ignorant people were using current, ordinary Greek. This contrast between their true language and the affected style of the schools is very characteristic. I may mention an anecdote. Saint Spyrido, one of the bishops of the first Oecumenical Synod, was present at a *σύναξις* in Cyprus, in which Triphyllius, bishop of Ledri, and formerly advocate at Beyrouth, preached, of course in a higher style. But when the learned man, in referring to the passage, Ἄρὸν σου τὸν κράββατον καὶ περιπάτει, used instead of *κράββατος* the Attic word *σκήμπους*, Spyrido made a disturbance before the people; he left at once his archieratical throne, saying to Triphyllius Οὐ σὺ γε

ἀμείνων τοῦ κράββατον εἰρηκότος : You are not better than He who said κράββατος. This fact, recorded by Hermeias Sozomenos and Nicephoros Callistos Xanthopoulos, proves also that, in the opinion of the early Christians, Jesus spoke not Aramaic, but Greek, and not Attic, but the κοινή.

Now what was the fundamental contrast between those two styles? To-day it is positively known that by the second century of our era the equalization of the long and short vowels, and the prevalence of accent over quantity had been accomplished in almost every Greek-speaking country. This is the most serious change in the whole history of Greek. But, of course, this slow change could not be accepted in the schools ; they were for a long time teaching the genuine prosody of the ancients (the educated persons felt it as late as the sixth century), the melodious versification of the poets, the pompous rhetoric of the orators, especially that of the Asiatic school, which was equally based on the prosody. The Christians, as simple catechists, were content to be ἀλιέων μαθηταί, pupils of the fishermen, and detested Hellenes. But when, like Triphyllius, many other learned men, for instance Gregory, Synesius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, became bishops, they could not, of course, forget their erudition, and they continued to write verse in classical metres. On the other hand, rhetoric was, like the Miltonian panoply of Christ, necessary to other bishops, for instance, to Basil and Chrysostom, to defeat their adversaries or to impress their followers. Thus the rhetorical style proved much more abiding than the idols. In the same manner the official historiography being always cultivated by men of high culture remained permanently Attic. From the style of the Byzantine historians we can only form an idea as to

the extent and estimation of the ancient studies. For this reason, any interpretation of them is superfluous to one who knows their models.

A new style, a new poetry, a new versification, according to the modified pronunciation, has been naturally created in the Church, where no ancient literary tradition existed, and singers of little education were to be utilized and illiterate people were to form the audience. Gregory himself, who wrote hexameter verses for his own delectation, when composing an evening song for the Church, used the rhythm, which was based on accent. This kind of song approached the spoken language through its pronunciation and its plainer construction. People having only ecclesiastical culture, especially monks, used it in writing numerous and long hymns and canons, and it is significant that the best of these composers, Romanos, was a simple deacon, whereas the educated theologians, like John Damascenus, could not help using archaic words and sometimes ancient metres. But they did not forget to make a side hit at Athens. In his famous Ἀκάθιστος Ὕμνος to the Holy Virgin, the Patriarch Sergius says :

χαῖρε τῶν Ἀθηναίων | τὰς πλοκάς διασπῶσα.

χαῖρε τῶν ἀλιέων | τὰς σαγήνας πληροῦσα.

Much nearer to the reality are the *συναξάρια* or Lives of martyrs and especially of saints, as they were composed by clergy, *πεζῶ καὶ ἀκαλλωπίστῳ καὶ χαμηλῷ χαρακτῆρι . . . εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι καὶ τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ τὸν ἀγράμματον ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων ὠφεληθῆναι*, as the first synaxarist, Leontios, bishop of Neapolis or Nemesos, says ; he really uses many popular words, but his whole style does not sound more modern than the Gospel. More vernacular were the popular summaries of history, which were written in the monasteries of the East by uneducated

people, an example of whom was the Syrian John Malalas, a contemporary of Justinian. But the chroniclers, also being taught in the schools, knew a good deal of the ancient grammar, though, fortunately for them, they did not proceed very far in the syntax.

The obscure period of ikonomachy, which prolonged from 726 to 842, inspired by a reforming spirit and caused by reasons not yet precisely estimated, resulted in the victory of the monastic party, which was the more ignorant of the two. And yet from a family belonging to it a prelate, who concentrated in himself all the ancient education, Photius, appeared. The illustrious Patriarch, besides many other attainments, was master of the art of writing Attic. His marvellous letters, in which his whole life is reflected, reveal in him a sort of Aristotelian interest in everything. Through his *Μυρίοβιβλος* and *λέξεων συναγωγή* he became a factor in the philological regeneration of Hellenic studies, which, after Photius, were cultivated not only by the laity, but also by bishops. The metropolitans, Eustratius of Nicaea, Gregory of Corinth, Michael Acominatus of Athens, and especially the famous Eustathius of Salonica, are also priests of the Muses. On the other hand, on account of the conflict with Latins, which has been caused by Photius rebutting the claims of the Pope, the rulers of the Empire come forward as pure Greeks and embrace with pride the cause of Hellenism.

But the linguistic result of all that tendency was again the complete separation of Greek into a written *ἀπτικίζουσα* language and a spoken *σολοικοβάρβαρος* one. The historians turned for their models to antiquity, and appeared to address not their contemporaries or generations to come, but, on the contrary, the demus of ancient Athens. Their only art was to find archaic and

uncommon words; they do not allude directly even to Christian matters and they Atticize even the names of places and men. For instance, Cinnamus, writing during the Crusades, calls the Turks Persians. What a strange evolution of Atticism, which resulted in the very opposite of its spirit, in the fossilization of its style!

The worst was that, from that time, the Church also participated in the archaistic fashion, because even the style of the holy books itself had departed from the vernacular. These very *συναξάρια* were, under Constantine Porphyrogenitus, translated by Symeon, who is hereby called *μεταφράστης*, in order to suit the style of the educated classes, and a Patriarch of the twelfth century threw into the fire a *συναξάριον* of St. Paraskeue, as unworthy of her life. Eustathius too, when bitterly reproaching the monks with being *ἀγράμματοι* and hating the *γραμματικοί*, addresses them in Attic style, full of classical allusions.

But it is easily understood that all the efforts of the scholars and the bishops could not prevent the people from making in their natural language verses scoffing at the Emperors, forming their proverbs, and praising their heroes, the *ἀκρίται*, the guardians of the frontiers of the Empire, which then extended to the Euphrates. As the written style became more dry and serious, the vernacular appeared in satirical and light literature. Theodorus Ptochoprodromus, with his supplicatory poems, is the type of this style.

Afterwards, when the fatal capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders had taken place (1204), and the Empire was broken into many Frankish and some Greek states, Greek education was no longer adequate to the necessities of life; the Greeks under the Frankish rule, having remained illiterate, involuntarily used

to write as they spoke, without any literary pretensions. Relics of those times are the Greek chronicles of kingdom of Cyprus under the Lusignans and the simplified chronicles of Morea. It is true that the Greek throne was restored at Constantinople for 192 years under the diadem of the Palaeologi, and the court historians continued to write in an Attic more strict than that of the times of Comneni, but their influence, that of the Emperors, was now very slight.

Later on, after the Ottoman invasion, during servitude of the Greek people, a scholarly tradition, of course, could not exist, except in slight degree among the clergy. Therefore, those who wished to express other feelings than prayers, and felt their eyes in tears from the memories of the past and their hearts full of hopes for a resurrection of the Empire, the anonymous bards, while eulogizing the unsubjected heroes of Greek mountains, continued the popular poetry which extolled the ἀκρίται. This style of writing was attempted by the poets of Crete, which was then under Venetian rule. But in the meantime the dialects had grown up. And when in the seventeenth century the enslaved Greeks had succeeded in founding schools, the scholarly tradition took a new lease of life. Once more the poor Ulysses opens his arms to embrace the pharos of Atticism. The polymath Eugenius Boulgaris, in the eighteenth century, was writing his numerous works in archaistic style, and translated Virgilian verse into Homeric. The famous Coray prohibited his genius in restraining that archaistic tendency within certain bounds. But these appeared insufficient after the war of independence. On the one hand the victories of Botzaris and Canaris turned men's minds so easily to Marathon, Salamis, and Athens; on

other, the multiplicity of new political and scientific wants resulted in the revival of many ancient words ; so that a scholarly tradition survives parallel to the spoken language. The former is followed by the Church—as is but right—by the State, and by science ; the latter by the poets, in accordance with the example of the inspired Solomos, and by certain novelists and writers of plays ; thus various kinds of literature are composed in a more natural or archaistic style, according as the writers wish to be more lively or serious. Hence arises a controversy which is sometimes conducted in a way like that of St. Spyrido. Notwithstanding, in speaking, modern Attic society, now in course of formation, selects, very calmly and fairly enough, though somewhat irregularly, from among the different forms, those alive or likely to live. Thus modern Attic, eclectic, as the ancient one, is formed slowly and naturally with the formation of society itself. Modern times are much more democratic than mediaeval. Nevertheless, in our souls survives the same instinct which was living, as we have seen, for twenty centuries, united with the national Hellenic feeling. For this reason, I suppose, we shall continue, voluntarily or involuntarily, to be more or less vassals to Olympian Pericles.

I have given the above historical outline of Greek style in the hope of making some facts clear. First, how it came about that new forms or new expressions, growing up naturally in Greek, were not welcomed by the educated classes, and how this contempt for 'barbarism' having been accepted by the critics, was extended to the whole later literature and the whole history of Greece. There is no doubt that the theory of barbarism was absurd ; but it was based on the

indisputable superiority of the ancient literature, upon which that of the Church came to be included. As a literary burden, I think, was never laid on the shoulders of any other people.

But this colossal attraction of the past explains another feature of later Greek ; namely, why its evolution, in comparison with that of Latin, which was broken asunder into the modern languages, has been so slow. One who compares the Greek style of the tenth century A.D., not the official, but the monastic, thinks he is reading St. Paul. This was because education tended to maintain the older language as a spoken language. Thus the Greek scholars never suspected irreparable change in their tongue. Having always religiously kept Euclides' spelling, they noticed the difference of the new forms, which they attributed to ignorance. But they never felt the principal cause of the growing difference, that is to say, the changing of the pronunciation, so natural to every spoken language.

It is now obvious how difficult a task it is to fix definite chronological limits in the history of Greek. As we have seen, no old phenomenon passes away in an abrupt manner, no new form prevails at once. A type takes centuries to disappear ; and even after its extinction in one place, it survives in another, when at last it is forgotten in the spoken language it is artificially preserved in the written, or at least in its more literary forms. A splendid example is the infinitive, which was declining from the times of the Septuagint and was barely eliminated by Coray in the last century. And, vice versa, the more we study the history of spoken Greek, the better we observe a form or a word, which we suppose to be modern, already presented itself many centuries ago, but it

kept away from *χαρτὶν καὶ καλαμάριν*, paper and inkstand. For instance, this very expression is of the seventh century¹; and most of the diminutives, like *χέρι(ν)*, *πόδι(ν)*, that is to say *χέριον* and *πόδιον* instead of *χέιρ* and *πούς*, which even to-day are not used in the books of scholars, are shown by their accent, which follows the rules of Herodian, to have been formed shortly after the time of Alexander and reduced to *χέριν* and *πόδιν* before Constantine the Great.

Now, gentlemen, you can appreciate the importance of living Greek. This stands before us as the last real and trustworthy phase of its history of three thousand years. The abundant linguistic material which is preserved from Corfu to Cyprus and from Thrace to Crete is a test, a commentary, and a supplement to the marbles, papyri, and parchments. This material is, of course, an inheritance of all the preceding generations, but it is the task of science to classify it in chronological order, and to work back to the past. Thus we observe that approximately the same language was spoken back to the times of the Crusades. Thence it shades into its precursor, the mediaeval language, which was avoided as *βάρβαρον*, the style of the Gospels, which was *ἀδόκιμον*, the *κοινή* which was *ιδιωτικόν*. Nearly all that the ancient grammarians condemned, has been preserved.

But the great gain from the study of contemporary Greek is the perception of the whole as a continuous and living language. I mean that after having defined every difference arising in its history, and the time at which it arose, we can conclude that the rest has remained unaltered. I may give some examples from my own studies. For instance, hearing in Cyprus

¹ *Λεοντίου Νεαπόλεως βίος Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἐλεήμονος*. Edit. H. Gelzer, Freiburg, 1893, p. 7, 16.

the single and double consonants exactly distinguished from each other—*τὸν φίλον*, and *τὸ φύλλον*—we may form an idea how the ancients pronounced them. Observing also how the ending *ν*, owing to its feeble pronunciation, is assimilated with the consonant of the next word—for instance, *θέλομεν μήλα, ἐκόψαμεν ῥόδια*—we understand perfectly the spelling of the ancient inscriptions. The composition and derivation of new words is also very instructive. Noticing the facility with which a peasant forms a new word, we explain the immense wealth of the Greek dictionary. Koumanoudes has collected the words formed by the scholars of the last century, and found fifty thousand. But the strange thing is that in many cases we cannot distinguish whether a word was coined lately or many centuries ago; for instance *ἀγριόθυμος* is used in a popular Cypriot poem (pronounced *ἀρκόθυμος*) and in an Orphic hymn. Euripides says *ἀλουσία* and the Cypriots not only *ἀλουσιά*, but also *ἀκτενισιά*. The Cypriots call the condition of a servant *δουλοσύνη* and the employment of a maker of sieves *μαντοσύνη*. Both these words occur in Homer, of course with the different meaning of *δοῦλος* and *μάντις*. Have they been preserved or coined again? For all these reasons Prof. Hatzidakis, the best authority on late Greek, proposed the construction of a colossal Lexicon, covering all Greek periods, ‘from Agamemnon to George the First.’ In this Thesaurus the history of every word would give us a new pleasure. We now say, for instance, *ἄλογον* instead of *ἵππος*; but it was Diodorus who used it first. And if we ask how the appellative of Calchas came to mean at last a sieve-maker, the answer will be that Theocritus calls *κοσκινόμαντις* the diviner by a sieve; thus we understand that every *κοσκινῶς* professed in Cyprus to foretell the future.

Now, as every language, like a river, brings down many superstitions, like the above one, legends, proverbs, topographical data, everybody can guess how many conclusions we can obtain by searching the Greek folklore. But do not be afraid, gentlemen; I shall not enter now into this labyrinth, fearing lest I may not find the way out. Those interested in this subject may turn to the works of Professor Polites.

I wish only to anticipate an objection. It may be said: All these questions are certainly interesting, but interesting only to the Greeks of to-day. But I think that it is *ἀνακόλουθον* to excavate the earth in the hope to find some more fragments of antiquity, and to leave the existing treasure unexplored. Such a search would give much more often that pleasure of discovery, which is the best reward of a scientist. I shall go further. The investigation of Greek as a whole interests not only the Hellenists, but also every one who philosophizes on the most wonderful creation of human nature, language. For Greek elucidates, like no other tongue, the question, What is the life of a language? The history of the modern languages of Latin origin presents many gaps. The monuments of the Gothic idioms end in the fourth century, with the translation of the Bible by Ulphilas. But with Greek we can work quite twelve centuries back to the past under full light; the golden chain has never been broken. Dictionaries, grammars, commentaries, are always abundant, some of them due to scholars of first eminence. Thus we can see, without much guessing, the evolution of the language, that is to say, in what manner the linguistic elements in the course of so many centuries appear and disappear, how words are born, change meaning and die, or die not, and especially how the whole, though transformed, survives.

The ancient Atticists could not know this evolution were stopped by the *οὐ κεῖται*. But, we, living after Müller and Whitney—must proceed. The philologic monuments have not, of course, always the same ar value. Perhaps by descending to later times studying familiar letters, private contracts, mor inscriptions, miracles of saints, we shall lose a litt the romantic admiration of the classic language o gods. But I hope, gentlemen, that a feeling, i positive, will be born in ourselves. Apart from colossal literature, apart from its value to the knowl of every science, I hope that you will admit that this unique phenomenon, a language which develops : for three thousand years, attracts in succession e civilized nation, civilizes many barbarous ones, enri every written language, and is still living in all countries where it was born. In fact, passing the Io: the Cretan Sea, the Archipelago, the Propontis, Euxine itself, in every town you visit, you hear *ἡρθες, ξένε*, as in the times of Nausicaa and Iphig. Then you would, perhaps, assign to this not unkn language the epithet—so many times convention applied to it—immortal.

With all these questions on which I have touch do not believe, gentlemen, that I have completec apology. With some of them I shall deal in my lectures. But before concluding, I beg to express best thanks to the University authorities, who ki invited me here. At this moment a strange t happens to me. I come from Athens, and yet I t that I am in Athens. While entering these hall which Attic is yet echoing—somewhat confusedly my ears—I believe that I am passing into the an Academy, coming from a distant province. My

culty is increased by the feeling that I am really barbarous in your universal language. But, after all, I hope that I shall be excused. I come to assure you that ἡ λαλέουσα παγὰ, the speaking spring of Greek, is not yet exhausted, and that that Greece, in which your and our Byron saw 'living Greece no more', did not die. While studying the continuous history of her noble language, and acquainting yourselves with her living pronunciation, you will come, no doubt, into closer relations with her. I venture to say that you will extend your biblical and classical studies. Universal conquerors of to-day, you keep always, like the Macedonian, the old Iliad ready at hand. Let me invite you, gentlemen, to join a humble son of Greece in studying the long and instructive Odyssey of the Greek nation.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Φωνητική τῶν σημερινῶν Κυπρίων (Ἀθηνᾶ, Vol. VI (1 pp. 145-173)

Ἡ γενικὴ κατὰ Κυπρίους (Ἀθηνᾶ, Vol. VIII (1896), pp. 450)

Κυπριώτικα τραγούδια (Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ ἱστορικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Vol. V (1897), pp. 346)

Γαλλικαὶ μεσαιωνικαὶ λέξεις ἐν Κύπρῳ (Ἀθηνᾶ, Vol. (1900), pp. 360-384)

Λεμεσός (Νέα Ἡμέρα, 8/21 Feb. 1903, No. 1471 (2459))

Ἡ Ῥήγαινα (Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἑθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Vol. VI (1903), pp. 117-148)

Περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν Κυπρίων (Ἀθηνᾶ, Vol. XVI (1 pp. 257-294)

Θρήνος τῆς Κύπρου (Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἑθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Vol. VI (1906), pp. 432)

Τοπωνυμικὸν τῆς Κύπρου (Ἀθηνᾶ, Vol. XVIII (1907) 315-421)

Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ῥοδίων ἀμφορέων, εὑρεθέντων ἐν Πάφῳ (Ἡμέρα, 15 May, 1907)

Where did Aphrodite find the body of Ado (Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. XXVIII (1 pp. 133-137)

ILLE EGO
Virgil and Professor Richmond

I L L E E G O

VIRGIL AND PROFESSOR RICHMOND

By

J. S. PHILLIMORE

Uerum ubi nulla mouet stabilem fallacia Nisum.—Cirius

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
MCMXX

ILLE EGO

Virgil and Professor Richmond

IN his inaugural address¹ to the Humanity Class at Edinburgh, Prof. Richmond refers to 'a recent attempt to drag in the *ego* of Virgil into the very first words of his final work, an attempt the frustration of which will suggest to us some considerations illustrative of the science of Humanity, and provide a brief example of the method'.

A wary reader will immediately be on the alert when he sees this. The words '*method*' and '*science of Humanity*' are danger signals. We know what sins are committed against reason in their name. παραπλήσιον γὰρ φαίνεται μαθηματικοῦ τε πιθανολογοῦντος ἀποδέχεσθαι καὶ ῥητορικὸν ἀποδείξεις ἀπαιτεῖν. And when an inquiry proposed as an example of method concerns itself with a matter so intrinsically interesting as the exordium of the Aeneid, Mr. Richmond's arguments deserve a close scrutiny.

The editor of Virgil for the O.C.T. series restores the lines

*'ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus auena
carmen, et egressus silvis uicina coegi
ut quamuis auido parerent arua colono,
gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis'—*

to the position which Nisus was in the habit of saying they had occupied before Varius' recension. This is what Mr. R. calls 'an attempt to drag in the *ego* of Virgil'; he has

¹ *Classics and the Scientific Mind*. Edinburgh, James Thin, Publisher to the University, 1919.

satisfied himself that he has 'frustrated' this attempt in five pages, and thereby provided a brief example of method. The claim to brevity may be allowed. Henry, on whom Mr. Richmond passes sentence that he was '*of brilliant but imperfectly balanced judgement*', devoted no less than 118 pages to the vindication of these verses. If there is one quality which distinguished Henry, it was his stickling for proofs dialectically tested and a decisive weight of evidence: it is a superficial estimate which confuses whimsical excursions of personality with ill-balanced judgement. Deep in Virgil, as hardly another modern has ever been, Henry was a cautious critic. Re-read his rigorous and massive reasoning, and you will be tempted to say in haste that the 'method' which Mr. R.'s pages briefly exemplify is the gay process of *ignoratio elenchi*. But then there is a sentence of his on p. 24 which might give colour to the conclusion that his method is pure paradox, and his object to make fools of his audience.

'*First words to the ancient mind, far more than to ours, were words of omen, and in a sense signature.*' But it is just the words of signature which Mr. R. is athetizing! What is left of a signature when you suppress all indication of authorship? The rest is irrelevance: for what has the question of omen or non-omen to do with the authenticity of the quatrain? There was nothing ill-omened in alluding to yourself in an exordium. Ovid, *Amores*, ii. 1 proves that—

'hoc quoque composui Paelignis natus aquis,
ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae.'

So does the author of *Ciris*. I know no reason why what was well-omened for a short poem should not also be well-omened for a long (and even a final) poem.

What, then, remains of the 'omen' and 'signature' argument?

Next, but still among preliminary considerations, I must quote more from p. 24:

The traditional first words of the Aeneid, *Armauirumque*, are familiar friends even to the least classical memory; they are constantly quoted by ancient writers to indicate by allusion the poem itself whose subject they epitomize; and they have the further claim to this position that they combine in one phrase allusion to the first words of both Iliad and Odyssey, *μῆνιν*, the wrath of Achilles, and *ἄνδρα*, the wanderer Odysseus.

(By what method can *arma* be made into an allusion to *μῆνιν*? It has been a commonplace of Virgilian criticism for fifteen hundred years that, in so far as the Aeneid is an epic of battle, the poet utilizes the Iliad; and *arma* probably¹ means 'battle'; but what is there in the battle-books of the Aeneid at all answerable to the sulking of Achilles?) But, to continue:

The Aeneid is an Odyssey for six books to which an Iliad in six books succeeds. Ask a schoolboy the first words of the Aeneid and he will know them; but turn to the Oxford text of Virgil, sent out from that great authoritative press since the year 1900 to be a Latin bible for schools and universities, and you will find a different state of affairs. *Arma uirumque* has become the fifth verse and lost all significance.

I hold no brief for the Clarendon Press: they may have been hideously mistaken in committing their edition of Virgil to Sir Arthur Hirtzel rather than to a schoolboy: if they imagined that they were issuing Virgil 'as a Latin bible', they would not strain at lesser blunders. But this

¹ Probably: though opinion has been much divided. I give Mr. R. the benefit of the doubt, for if *arma* = ἄπλᾱ the disparity with *μῆνιν* is even more glaring.

appeal to the schoolboy is suspiciously like the method of Macaulay, the bluster of prejudice, and the voices of a minority silenced by brass and wind. It is our old friend '*We-always-thought*'. Test it by analogy: ask a schoolboy (if schoolboys still read the Elegy) with what lines Gray introduces the Epitaph, and he will know them:

'Approach and read (for thou canst read) the lay
Graved on the stone beneath yon aged thorn.'

But an editor of the Elegy (whether or not as part of an English bible) will be bound to show, by whatever typographical means he may choose, that Gray originally had another stanza after that:

'There scatter'd oft, the earliest of the year,
By hands unseen, are show'rs of violets found;
The redbreast loves to build and warble there,
And little footsteps lightly print the ground.'

Ask a schoolboy (if schoolboys read Wordsworth) the first words of *Dion*, and he will know them:

'Serene, and fitted to embrace,
Where'er he turned, a swanlike grace,'
&c.

But it is an editor's business to record—

'Fair is the swan, whose majesty, prevailing
O'er breezeless water on Locarno's lake,'
&c.

although these lines were afterwards proscribed. Whether these two poets were well or ill advised in their after-thoughts, is another question; I am merely showing by modern instances that editors neglect their office if they accept for standard that last dilution of literature, the

school-book. And here it will not be out of place to quote from an admirable palinode of resipiscence by Dr. Vollmer (*quod minime reris*) of Munich: ¹

Aber wir müssen noch die Frage aufwerfen: wie ist es gekommen und möglich gewesen, dass die Meinung, die ganze oder fast die ganze Appendix Vergiliana sei unecht, sich bilden und behaupten konnte? Wir können, das ist die Lösung, hier einmal den verhängnisvollen Einfluss der Schule auf die literarische Tradition mit Händen greifen. Untergegangen ist die ganze gelehrte Literatur, die sich an Vergil's Namen und Werke anschloss, von Hyginus und Asconius bis zur Vita Suetoni; was sich erhalten hat, sind die *spärlichen entstellten und verwässerten Reste all dieser Arbeit, aufgenommen in und verarbeitet für eine Reihe von erklärenden Schulausgaben.*

Et Saul inter prophetas. Dr. Vollmer's contention concerns primarily the Minor Works; but it is also true that in every respect the body of Virgilian lore has been dissected and reduced to suit the measure of Mr. R.'s arbiter, the schoolboy. And the fact stated is incontestable, for the names of the critics who wrote on Virgil have been recorded; and of this mass of writing no more than a meagre fraction has been preserved in Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, Servius, Donatus: so that Mr. R. is under an (p. 26) extraordinary delusion when he says

The story, like the verses, is feeble; but the later commentators rescued both, for the reason *that every scrap of Virgil legend, true or false, interested them.*

If so, they dissembled or controlled their interest marvellously well: of Caecilius Epirota, Virgil's contemporary, they have rescued nothing; of Hyginus,

¹ *Die kleineren Gedichte Vergils*, Munich, 1907, p. 372.

Modestus, Cornutus, Asper, Probus, a few dozen lines altogether. Every scrap of Virgil legend! It is to be hoped that the reformed Edinburgh School of Humanity will not disdain, amongst more recondite fields of inquiry, to research into Ribbeck's *Prolegomena*, or Nettleship's *Introductions*—or even Teuffel-Schwabe's *History of Latin Literature*. If by 'legend' is implied fable, even the interpolated codices of Donatus contain but very few scraps of such; and, almost without exception, the added stories bear a plainly mediaeval character. (See the interpolations in Σ as exhibited in Brummer's app. crit.)

Besides the school-book, there is, in this case, another very important factor to remember: officialism. Virgil was a Government author; Varius and Tucca edited his works under direct imperial commission. Their edition was the official text, the Authorized Version. Now we know from our own literary history what prestige can be given to a book by Government *imprimatur*. There are many persons to whom the Douai-Rheims version of the Scriptures is hardly now known; they would be hurt if you suggested that they were illiterate. But it is only lately that any one can whisper a word against the Jacobean Version without risking penalties. We have our 'official' truth; our 'official' view of history; our 'official' lives of public persons,—it may be a poet, as Wordsworth, or a sovereign, as Victoria. It is the business of Officialdom to see that nothing escapes, and anecdotes have hard work to slip through the cordon; even harmless anecdotes, for a solemnity gathers round great names. The genius of officialdom is suspicious even of curiosity: a casual tourist becomes a Guy Faux if he is found prying about Westminster. And the early Principate had many exposed

nerves. Of officialism in the Virgil tradition we have one clinching example: the fate of the *laudes Galli* in Georg. Bk. iv. No sane critic, one might say, no critic not congenitally disqualified for estimating a point of common human psychology, can imagine that the fact reported by Servius was fiction. (Caecilius Epirota's direct witness on this particular point would have been priceless.) Yet not a line, not a syllable of the passage has been allowed to survive. And so it was with all the Opera Minora. Survive they did, but only to slink about as poor relations. The schoolboy knew them not. Hence the weakness of their manuscript tradition.

So the authenticity of our four verses is no more disproved by the Authorized Version suppressing them than is the existence of the *laudes Galli*. All our manuscripts of Virgil represent the controlled tradition, the Palatine text; officially sacred, like the 'Annexed Book'; true 'in a Parliamentary sense', like the answers of Ministers in the House of Commons. But it would be very simple-minded to take it for the whole truth.

The 'greater scholars' whom Mr. R. alleges to have tacitly repudiated the lines were only publishers and book-sellers. An argument from the silence of *lost* authors is surely rather a tall order. If Donatus, Servius, Priscian, &c., either give the story about Nisus or quote the four lines without reservation, to them an argument from silence does apply: if they mention no refutation of Nisus, then

'tacent; satis laudant'

Preliminaries thus cleared, we can proceed to pose the main question for discussion.

Somebody wrote these four verses. Who? Virgil or

another? If another, who was the forger and what was his motive?

Mr. R. replies (p. 28):

The author of this exercise I conceive to have been Nisus himself, the schoolmaster, whose legend is our only ancient source for the verses, and whose word would be of no value for any compositions but his own.

The reasoning of the last sentence is dark to me, I confess; but let that pass. We have Mr. R. admitting that he can suggest no other author for the verses than Nisus. The issue is simplified. What then was the man's motive?

It is easy enough to conjecture the occasion for the spurious lines. The fourth book of the Georgics does end with a modest autobiographical note, a mere subscription in verse, by which the poet claims as his own the first, second, and third books preceding and also his earlier bucolic Eclogues, whose first verse he here quotes in his last. In a complete edition of Virgil, *such as would not appear till long after the separate publication of the Aeneid*, this subscription would fall immediately before the first verse of the Aeneid, and might suggest, either to an editor or a student, an exercise in imitation, which should purport to link up the Aeneid also with the rounded whole of the rest.

One can hardly restrain a smile, to see Mr. R. so anxiously limiting the significance of

‘*illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat*
Parthenope’

to suit his contention that it was not in character with Virgil's known modesty to write a personal *envoi* to the Aeneid. Therefore it is carefully explained to us that an *envoi* at the beginning and an *envoi* at the end of a poem are quite quite different things; and will we please be good children and not too inquisitive?

But one must be inquisitive about what is professed as an example of method, and I must beg leave to ask: (1) What is there less 'modestly autobiographical' in the *ille ego* lines than in those words of signature

'*illo Vergilium me tempore*'?

(2) What grounds are there for saying that a complete edition of Virgil only appeared 'long after' 19 B.C.?

(3) Why should the need, or the convenience, of an *envoi* for the Aeneid strike a reader who possessed a one-volume Virgil more forcibly than a reader who had him in the *format* of a collection of single rolls?

(4) If it is 'easy to conjecture' that the *envoi* subscriptio to *Georg.* iv suggested to Nisus an *envoi* prologue to *Aeneid* i, does not that imply an obvious *a priori* fitness? Why should it not have suggested itself to Virgil?

One is reminded that the nineteenth century produced a race of human beings who believed that the *Culex* was 'written up' to the Gnat's Epitaph, which alone was allowed to be Virgilian.

So far, then, we are nothing advanced towards a solution of the problem, as defined for trial. But now comes Mr. R.'s main argument against Virgil's and for Nisus' authorship. It may be reduced under four heads:

1. The literary merit of the verses.
2. Their Latinity.
3. The worth of Nisus as an authority.
4. The evidence of Propertius.

1. Mr. R. finds the four verses less than neat, Sir A. Hirtzel dubbed them *præclarissimos*. The matter is hardly worth discussion. *Culex* may contain much that is unworthy of Virgil, and yet be his work. The opinion of

us modern grammatici on a point of taste will decide nothing, and the opinion of great poets is divided. Dryden, indeed, denounced them; but if Spenser and Milton imitated them, the verses cannot have seemed trashy to Spenser and Milton. However, as proof or disproof cannot turn merely on a point of taste, we may leave it at that.

2. This is the very core of the debate. Here it is not a matter of likes and dislikes but a question capable of strict proof. If nothing *un-Augustan* can be found in the verses, then the attack on Nisus' statement plainly loses force. Pope may write unlike himself, on occasion, but he does not write like Tennyson. Here, then, Mr. R.'s statement must be closely sifted, line by line.

(a) It will at once be seen that the word *Martis* adds nothing to *arma* except a slight incongruity; for the 'arms' of the 'man' himself were not so much of Mars as of Vulcan.

If *arma Martis* is tautology, we must athetize Eclogue x. 44:

'nunc insanus amor duri me *Martis in armis*'?

For the rest I need not recapitulate Henry's argument for taking *arma* as *warfare*. But can the opening of the Authorized Version be so vastly superior if the first word of it is equivocal? I suppose nobody will hesitate what

'*horrentia Martis arma*'

means, or fail to recognize the contrast of this theme with those of *Bucolics* and *Georgics*. But should anybody insist on taking *arma* as ὄπλα, still the word *Martis* is not amiss: for husbandmen have their *arma* too. *Operisque relinquunt arma sui* (Ov. *Met.* xi. 35).

(b) 'But *horrentia* is conventional.' Of course it is:

most of the epithets in Virgil are. Such is the way of Classicism.

Rocks are hard, skies are blue, water is liquid, wars are cruel :

‘bella, horrida bella’ (*Aen.* vi. 86).

‘Merely’ conventional, may be questioned : for in contrast with the ‘slender oat’ and the Underwoods of Pastoral, the humble, homely, local utilities of Points of Husbandry, would it not be rather unsymmetrical if the new and strange (*at nunc*) subject were not coloured with an epithet, the *horrible fray of Battle*?

(c) Then what is the distinction between the words *colono* (with *arua*) and *agricolis*, both of which are derived from the root of *colere*, to cultivate? If there is no distinction, we have mere pleonasm.

Mr. R.’s blows are meant for Nisus, but they fall on Virgil. What about this?

‘hiems ignaua *colono* :

frigoribus parto agricolæ plerumque fruuntur.’

(*Georg.* i. 299.)

Anybody who cultivates the earth is *agricola* ; but in the north of Italy, and especially for the generation after Philippi, the most conspicuous among the landed population were the *coloni*. The words are not truly synonymous : a rustic god is *agricola deus* (*Tibull.* i. 1. 14) ; but you could not say *deus colonus*.¹ The *colonus* is the new man, the dispossessor, the planter on a confiscated farm ; he is a harmful worthy hustler who means to get rich quick, and has a notion of exploiting the land pitilessly (*ante Iouem nulli subigebant arua coloni*—*Georg.* i. 125) : he is

¹ Though an ox can be called *ruricola* and *colonus* (*Ov. Met.* xv. 124, 142). But the audacity of the metaphor is in itself a piece of Pythagorean pleading.

sturdily ambitious (*hinc laudem fortes sperate coloni*—Georg. iii. 288). But the Georgics find favour with anybody who lives on the land (*gratum opus agricolis*).

(d) How can the poet who incites the husbandman to 'constrain the soil' to his will, properly be said to 'constrain the soil' himself for the husbandman's use? This is possibly Silver Latin, but not an earlier style.

The bungling forger betrayed by an anachronism! In fact, just what might have been expected of Nisus, the Schoolmaster. Nowhere are Mr. R.'s frustrations more unfortunate than here. Of that common figure by which a poet is said to do himself what he makes his persons do, Henry (p. 108) happens to quote only an example from Martial; and it is commoner in Statius than others.¹ These are Silver Authors, but did Horace² write Silver Latin?

'*Turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona.*'

(*Sat.* i. 10. 36.)

Furius described, not performed, the killing of Memnon, &c. Is the Sixth Eclogue Silver Latin?

'*Pasiphaen niuei solatur amore iuenci*' (*Ecl.* vi. 46).

Silenus describes, not performs, the comforting of Pasiphae, just as in vv. 62, 63

'*Phaethontidas musco circumdat amarae
corticis atque solo proceras erigit alnos*'

he describes, not performs, the surrounding and uprearing. Is the *Culex* Silver Latin? It has a curious development of this figure (v. 29). Did the author of the *Ἐπιτάφιος Βίωνος* write Silver Latin?

Βίων ἐνόμει

καὶ σύριγγας ἔτευχε καὶ ἀδέα πόρτιν ἀμελγε (81, 82).

¹ A collection of exx. in Gronovius' *Diatribae*, chap. xxii.

² Cf. *Sat.* ii. 5. 41.

(e) Finally, but most important, could Virgil ever have spoken of a 'greedy husbandman' (*quamuis avido colono*)? One chief moral of his writings on husbandry is that the tiller of the soil has the simplest needs and is free from the avarice of the towns; nowhere does he suggest competition for profits. But this view of the countryman might possibly occur to a townbred man of the Silver Age, used to profiteering market gardeners.

One has only to recall Varro's *Res Rusticae* to refute this notion that competition for profits was unknown to the Virgilian race of countrymen, and invented by the degenerate Silver Age. To give a single instance;¹ Varro's two Faliscan soldiers, who averaged 10,000 sesterces per annum for their honey alone and 'could afford to wait for a rise of prices'. *R. R.* iii. 14. 10.

'Could he have spoken of a greedy husbandman?' One does not require any special 'sense of Virgil's economy of language' or 'acquaintance with his personal character' (p. 29) to answer this question: no delicate inferences are needed for a clear case. He did.

'illa seges demum uotis respondet *auari*
agricolae' (Georg. i. 47).

Auarus, I take it, is a harsher word than *avidus*. And if parallel passages go for anything, Ovid echoed

'ut quamuis avido parerent arua colono'

when he wrote

'frugibus immensis avidos satiate colonos'
(Fasti i. 677).

I have stuck strictly to the points impugned by Mr. R.;

¹ The passage was made famous by Virgil's famous echo of a phrase in it.

others are abundantly illustrated by Henry. What is left standing of the assertion that the four verses are 'certainly not Virgilian in diction'?

3. Now for Nisus' story. This otherwise unknown Schoolmaster flourished, in Nettleship's opinion, in the age of Tiberius, about half a century after Virgil's death. The grammatici did not deal in higher learning, as a rule, and his word would have weighed little in his own age against the greater scholars who accepted *arma uirumque* without demur. Had there been any truth in his story it would have been handed down to us on far better authority. But Nisus only claimed to have it by hearsay from unnamed older men; and evidently did not himself read the verses where the Oxford editor has printed them. He says expressly that Varius, the first editor, corrected the beginning by the removal of these verses. Nor does he categorically assert that the verses removed were by Virgil.

Poor Nisus! An 'elementary schoolmaster' (p. 25), otherwise unknown', and he had the temerity to persist in recording what the older generation told him. But he is not quite unknown, since Velius, Charisius, and Priscian all quote him as an authority on points of usage, grammar, and orthography. '*Nisus eleganter*' says Charisius, citing his opinion on *mella* and *uina*. There was nothing obscure about him to them; since one name explained his identity, nobody troubled to tell us his other ones. He was a scholar, as the word *grammaticus* indicates.

In what sense Mr. R. uses the term 'Higher' learning, I know not. The adjective often conveys a nuance of euphemistical negation. People smile at 'Higher Criticism', 'Higher Thought', 'Higher Christianity', &c., because in these phrases 'Higher' denotes the esoteric pretensions of a self-sufficient coterie. But if Mr. R. means to imply that Nisus was talking of things beyond his beat, then one

must ask him whence he derives his idea of a *grammaticus*. He quite misconceives the competence implied by the term. It is surprising that any man who had read Suetonius' *de Grammaticis* could pen the paragraph that I have quoted. Just recall to mind the famous

*Cato grammaticus, Latina Siren,
qui solus legit et facit poetas,*

and imagine anybody telling Cinna and Ticide and Bibaculus that their master was not a dealer in higher learning. However, instead of retailing the list of great Augustan and Tiberian scholars whom Suetonius chronicles as *grammatici*, it will suffice to summon the *grammaticus* or *philologus* described by Seneca in *Epist. Mor.* 108. To him Virgil or Cicero is a text for linguistic, stylistic, historical, or literary commentary; he traces the Ennian or the Homeric influences on a given phrase, &c. This *grammaticus* looks like a real person; he is about contemporary with Nisus. He may have been Nisus himself. Seneca slights him because he does not turn his Virgil into flatulent moralities. But he is evidently adequate for the functions of a school of *hautes études*—if that has anything to do with 'higher learning'. And after all, what was Nisus *ex hypothesi* doing? Not deciding some fine question of scholarship, but merely recording what the last generation had told him. What does he mean by *seniores*? Since he is a scholar, and the academic society of lecturers, librarians, and authors was fully developed under Augustus, we have a right to interpret *priores* as the men of letters of the last generation. And since Nisus (Keil, *G. L.* vii. 45) *floruit* shortly after Verrius Flaccus, who was appointed to a chair at the Palatine as early as 10 B.C.,

we have quite a short and easy reach for oral tradition. To name no others, old Seneca lived on till A.D. 39, bearing in his marvellous memory all the record of Augustan literary history. Nisus may easily have spoken with him. And Mr. R. expects us to believe that the verses were forged in that age! ¹

¹ One of Suetonius' remarks has received less attention than it deserves. Reconstructing his statement by the parallel use of Donatus (Brummer, *Vit. Verg.* p. 11. 201) and Philargyrius (ibid. p. 44, 106) we get this:

<i>Donatus.</i>	<i>Philarg. I.</i>
quamuis igitur multa pseudepigrapha, id est falsa inscriptione, sub alieno nomine sint prolata ut Thyestes tragoedia huius poetæ quam Varius suo nomine edidit, et alia huius modi; tamen bucolica liquido Vergilii esse minime dubitandumst, &c.	quamuis igitur multa alia inscriptione sub aliena sint prolata et Varius sub nomine suo edidit tamen bucolica liquido Vergilii esse minime dubitandum

Now the prevailing colour of modern criticism has been to deny to Virgil anything but the official works. But Suetonius, it seems, so far from supposing that spurious writings were put out under his name, states quite a different thing: that Virgil's work had been freely pirated, naming in particular the *Thyestes* which Varius claimed to have written. Nobody else, says Suetonius, can lay claim to the *Bucolics*; because Virgil explicitly asserts his authorship in

'carmina qui lusi pastorum', &c.

And to Suetonius goes back the catalogue (see Vollmer, *op. cit.*) which allows *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Diræ*, &c., to be Virgilian, with only a query attached to *Aetna*.

The point deserves fuller consideration than the scope of this paper permits.

The justice of Vollmer's observations (quoted above) once realized, such statements as that 'greater scholars accepted *arma uirumque* without demur' and 'Had there been any truth in the story it would have been handed down to us on far better authority', have the bottom knocked out of them. Who were these greater scholars? And what do we know of their opinion on the matter? If, as is usually allowed, Donatus follows Suetonius what reason is there for excepting this particular detail and presuming it to be un-Suetonian? Does not the very word *aiebat* suggest that it comes from an author within range of oral tradition from Nisus? As Suetonius would be. The story of the *laudes Galli* is reported by Servius, who does not name his authority. The vindication of our four lines is by so much the stronger as it is the more circumstantial. And it is of the very nature of the case that where suppressed verses are in question, school-editions and popular editions will not show them.¹ Because the suppressed stanza from the Elegy is not in the Golden Treasury, are you to suppose that Mason had forged it and reckon Palgrave as disbelieving him? That interesting anecdote, that Virgil once pleaded a suit, comes to us on no higher authority than Donatus alone.² Are we to reject it? No: it is to be accepted because it is agreeable to what we know of Virgil (Sen. *Controv.* iii, *Praef.* 8), because no plausible reason can be assigned for a fiction; and because we presume Suetonius behind Donatus.

Similarly there are no grounds for rejecting a piece of tradition warranted by the word of a scholar who may easily have spoken with many of Virgil's contemporaries.

¹ Cf. another example in Seneca Rhetor, *Suas.* iii. 7.

² Donat. *Vita*, l. 48, ed. Brummer.

No grounds : because the *onus probandi* lies on those who refuse to accept Nisus' statement ; and the attempt to show any intrinsic improbability in the four verses, whether of diction or *éthos*, has collapsed under examination.

We may agree with Dryden, or agree with Spenser and Milton in our personal taste ; but the merit of the verses is neither here nor there. Varius' editorial judgement may have been right or wrong : by a lucky accident, we are enabled, for once, to go behind it.

4. There remains only the witness of Propertius (which Pierius used to prove the genuineness of the four verses, ap. Henry, p. 13). Because (in ii. 34) Propertius says :

‘qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitât arma
iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.’

Mr. R. infers

that he had read the beginning of the Aeneid three years before it passed to Virgil's executors for publication, and it began with the passage we know (p. 28).

The inference cannot be allowed. Propertius is taking a summary view of Virgil's poems from memory.

(a) He touches the Bucolics in these terms (ii. 34. 67, 68):

‘tu canis umbrosi subter pineta Galaesi
Thyrsin et attritis Daphnin arundinibus.’

Well : there is no Galaesus in the Eclogues as we have them. Does it follow that Propertius had a different text ?

(b) Then for the Georgics he has :

‘tu canis Ascraei ueteris praecepta poetae,
quo seges in campo, quo uiret uua iugo’.

Does it follow that Books iii and iv were unknown to him? His allusion only bears on i and ii.

(c) Mr. R. infers from *arma* that Propertius alludes to *arma uirumque*. Why is it not equally legitimate to infer that he had in his ear the sound of

‘ipse deos in Dardana *suscitat arma*’ (*Aen.* ii. 618) ‘

(a phrase of almost unexampled rarity) and that

‘iactaque *Lauinis*¹ *moenia litoribus*’

echoes

‘promissa *Lauini*
moenia’ (*Aen.* i. 258).

I do not deny an allusion to *Aen.* i. 2, but I deny that the allusion is limited to that; and there is the warning of

‘*subter pineta Galaesi*’

staring us in the face to forbid us from taking an imaginative recollection for an exact statement. But even allowing (*per impossibile*) that Propertius alludes to

‘*arma uirumque cano*’

and, to that alone, Mr. R.’s conclusion remains, for all that, nothing more nor less than an assumption. For the *envoi* lines might be there all the time, yet since the *envoi* lines do not indicate the matter of the poem, which is what he is concerned to suggest, it would have been absurd to quote them. The opening of *Paradise Regained* illustrates the point aptly enough: suppose a poet wishing to indicate the various Miltonic poems by allusion: of the three first lines of the final epic:

¹ He had no choice but to use the contracted form for *Lauiniis* since the other was impossible for dactylic verse.

‘I who erewhile the happy Garden sung
 By one man’s disobedience lost, now sing
 Recovered Paradise to all mankind ...’

he must necessarily neglect the first two as inoperative and his allusion only begin to apply to the third.

And if Propertius’ words are to be so closely pressed, why are we not entitled to gather from his

‘*qui NUNC Aeneae*’

that he was acquainted with

‘*AT NUNC horrentia Martis
 arma*’?

I submit, then, that no grounds have been established for supposing that Donatus has not transmitted to us, as usual, what he found in Suetonius; or that Suetonius refused credit to Nisus’ statement; or that Nisus’ statement involves any intrinsic improbability. And it has been shown that none of the objections made by Mr. R. on the score of diction or matter are solidly founded. No human being can *prove* the truth of Nisus’ statement; but if the state of the case has been rightly conceived, since the attempt to *disprove* it fails, the four verses remain in possession. The reader must judge how the method, of which that attempt was proclaimed an example, stands examination.

